

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 4719	PA 330	Feb 1965
Senate:	p 2412-2424	13
House:	p 3141-3163	23
Education:	p 623-724	102

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

138 p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2018

S 62

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1965

FEB. SPEC. SESSION

VOL. 11, PART 7
JUNE 8 - JUNE 9
2304 - 2792

AND

DEC. 13, SPEC. SESSION
SENATE, JAN. 26, 1966

328.2s

C76pr

s

Leg. Ref.

Vault 3

CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY

June 8, 1965

109

cestes.

THE CHAIR:

Page 15 of the Calendar.

Senator from the 22nd.

SENATOR GLADSTONE:

Mr. President, on page 15 of the Calendar, may Calendars 1272, 1273, 1275, 1276 and 1277 all stand over and retain their places on the Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1270. File 1031. Substitute for House Bill No. 4719. An act establishing a state system of higher education. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Appropriations.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 14th.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

This again is perhaps the most important contribution to higher education of this session of the General Assembly, perhaps,

June 8, 1965

110

many previous sessions and many sessions to come. This bill is a result of a commission which was appointed by the Governor, a study commission on higher education. After two years of a thorough and solid work, the commission's report was handed to the Governor and to the General Assembly. The bill which we have before us is basically the recommendation of this commission. The commission is designed to provide direction and comprehensive planning for all of Connecticut's public facilities for higher education. It provides that under a commission of higher education which be appointed by the Governor, consisting of sixteen members, that all our institutions be coordinated under this. The Governor will appoint twelve members of these commissions. The twelve members of the commission, at least one of whom be affiliated with a non-public college or university. They will serve eight year terms; they will hopefully take offices as soon as they are appointed. In addition to the twelve members who have been outlined, there will also be a member on the commission who will represent the state board of education; a member who will serve from the board of trustees from the University of Connecticut, from the state colleges and from the regional junior colleges. The purpose of the commission is first to coordinate planning for higher education. It will also have the power to establish an advisory council with representatives of both public and private colleges of universities. It will conduct and make an impartial study of legislative proposals and requests, and reports for findings of these proposals to the Governor and the

June 8, 1965

111

General Assembly. For the first time in the State of Connecticut, we will have a coordinated approach to higher education. The commission will also be indistinguishable to institutions of higher education, and will report periodically to the Assembly. In addition to other powers of the commission, the authority for the operation of the state's institutions of higher education will be vested in their boards of trustees. The board of trustees will be the University of Connecticut will still have jurisdiction over the indistinguishable. It also sets up a twelve man board of trustees for the state indistinguishable which are now under the state board of education. It also sets up a board of trustees of twelve members for community colleges. It leaves the responsibility for the state technical institutes in the state board of education. One important feature of the bill rests in the power of this commission to arbitrate disputes between boards of constituent units, upon written request. The commission is given the power to appoint a chief executive officer and other necessary staff. It will also provide a greater degree of flexibility in the transfer of personnel and greater coordination in programming in our institutions of higher education. We, who, worked on this bill feel very strongly that this commission presents us with the opportunity to really indulge in some comprehensive planning in higher education, in a public sense. We feel that the unmet needs are very great, and this commission really commit us in the State of Connecticut to a great personal commitment in the favor of public education. I would like to say that although there are

June 8, 1965

112

changes that take place in the bill concerning the transfer of the responsibility to the state colleges from the state board of education into this new commission. This is intended in no way to be a reflection on the operation of the state board in relation to these colleges. These colleges have gone and prospered under the direction of the state board, and it is only because we are attempting to unify higher education that we have included them in this new proposal. Several members of the Circle, Senator Verriker and Senator Hammer, in particular, spent a good deal of time and energy on the commission. I know that they will have some things to add to the discussion of the bill. One of the most important things that the bill does, is that it emphasizes the roll of the regional community colleges. Up to now, we have had no central direction of these colleges, and they have begun to develop in a rather scattered "wily nily" fashion. By putting these regional junior colleges under a board of twelve members with the overall direction of the commission on higher education, we feel that we will be meeting the tremendous needs, in terms of swelling enrolments in all of our post-secondary institutions. We will, perhaps, most importantly be planning a directed and economical sense for meeting the needs of our young people. The state colleges have emerged in recent years, not only as outstanding teacher training institutions, but they have also launched themselves on a program for the liberal arts. We feel that under this new commission that this direction will be, not only continued, but the momentum will be speeded up. We will,

June 8, 1965

113

we think that in all reference to the use of Connecticut, that we must indulge in this kind of comprehensive kind of planning so that we can meet these needs that are so very important to us all.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further?

Senator from the 12th.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I rise with the greatest enthusiasm to support passage of this bill. As a member of the study commission and of the education commission of the legislature, I have learned and all the other members of the particular problems of our state and all the states of the union in this period of history. This has been brought on by two major factors; one the tremendously increasing number of high school graduates, and the other, the complexity our changing society in which everyone, almost without exception, needs further education beyond the high school to make his way in life. There were needs and gaps that had to be filled; there was nothing at all in the state of Connecticut, in tax supported institutions of higher education to take care of the lower fifty-five percent of high school graduates. Our state colleges and our university and our technical institute up to very recent time, have accepted the top fifty percent; but the pressures and the number of applicants is so great that this percentage is rising. It is only about the top thirty-five percent can now be admitted. Nothing for all these other boys and

June 8, 1965

114

girls graduating from a high school in tax supported institutions. The other particular need and gap which was needed to be filled has been nothing, really nothing, in vocational and occupational programs which there is such a crying need in the tax supported institutions. Our policy has been all along and on both these committees, not to injure any of the existing institutions, but to fill the need and the vacuum which existed in various areas. This we have tried to do with this bill. The Senator from the fourteenth has explained this in very good terms. The main thing, aside, from the commission is the recommendation for a series to be begun very gradually of state supported community colleges which will fill the needs of our, which I have just referred to take care of the lower sixty-five percent of our high school graduates; and to take care of these vocational and occupational programs. Now, I want to explain one thing that I hear complained about quite frequently. The Senator from the twenty-sixth, who hasn't his seat voice, is concerned about this. I tell you generally, "why add more boards to our existing set-up and so forth". I think it is well to point out why. The main reason, the reason is that there has been no one indistinguishable that I have spoken about. The University of Connecticut and the state board of education was for the two existing groups in higher education. indistinguishable. Their nature is such, that the statutes and customs dictate that neither can be super-imposed upon the other. Each has its own jurisdiction, and the rest of the educational needs have been left out. There is no way, unless you

June 8, 1965

115

put across all of them, some coordinating groups, there is no way to take care of all the needs of Connecticut. I want to add one more thing. I simply have to take off my hat to the Senators from the fourteenth district, the Chairman of the committee, who was not on the study commission; she came into the problem as I would say a little cold; she had those of us who were on the commission to bring out this bill which has been through the fire with all of us concerned and which we think is the nearest thing to a meeting the needs, meeting the needs which we can possibly recommend to you here. I strongly recommend passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Hammer. The Senator from the twenty-sixth district appreciates the lamp of learning shedding a little more light on this legislation for the benefit of this Senator.

Senator from the 34th.

SENATOR CARLSON:

Mr. President, I for one am very glad to see this bill before us today. I know those on the commission and those who have worked so hard on the education committee to get this bill in proper shape before us should be commended. Having served on the education committee in the legislature since 1955, and having been a co-chairman in 1961, I fully appreciate the need for this legislation before us today. Those who have served on the education committee for many years and have had the many bills before us, that we had to struggle with and to determine whether the

June 8, 1965

116

greatest need was, and in our own limited period of time to come up with a job that we could be proud of. Certainly in the past has felt a great need for this coordinating commission on higher education in Connecticut. Just the other day, in the contrast of the University of Connecticut, the admission's office, I find that their admissions this year are running, the applications for admissions are running somewhere around seventeen thousand applications. This is a tremendous impact on the university; because we all know that all these youngsters are not fully qualified in cases; Some cases they are going to other places. I am told that approximately three thousand qualified students will be turned away from our institutions of higher education in Connecticut this year. The impact of the population growth of some years ago is now being felt. I think this coordination and the uniform development of this institution of higher learning in Connecticut, under this commission, is going to see Connecticut going forward as they always have in all areas of education. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks on the bill?

Senator Tansley.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE IN THE CHAIR:

SENATOR TANSLEY:

Mr. President, this is a striking coincidence that our Senate Chairman of the education committee referred to this bill as the most important bill of higher education. I can well remember the member of the education committee two years ago, our

June 8, 1965

117

late Senator DiLoreto speaking exactly those words; but he described the original bill which established the study of the higher commission on education which has resulted in the bill we have before us now. He attached great interest to it, and great importance to it. Much of the work which has been accomplished is due to his dedication. It is gratifying to see this bill before us. I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks?

Senator Relihan.

SENATOR RELIHAN:

Mr. President, when the report of the study commission became public, Mr. Babbidge of the University of Connecticut threatened to resign and the members of other people prominent on education systems were quite disturbed. I think that there is some reflection here on the job which has been done here by the state board of education. It is my feeling that in Connecticut we have an outstanding reputation in Dr. Sanders; and we have a good public supported school system and tax free colleges of any state in the Union. In recent years, we have spent more and more money each year to make these schools better schools. I certainly hope that there is no reflection upon Commissioner Sanders and the state board of education. I want to make it clear that I am not at all enthusiastic about this bill because I feel that it is just creating another board, another commission, and I am not sure that it is going to do a better job than has

June 8, 1965

118

already been done.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks?

Senator Pope.

SENAAOR POPE:

Mr. President, very briefly, I will support this bill with great enthusiasm. I think that this is one of the major steps of the session.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks?

Senator Verriker.

SENATOR VERRIKER:

Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to speak in favor of this bill. Connecticut is about to enter a new phase in higher education. This is like a historic moment for education in our state. I, as a member of the study commission of higher education created by the previous session of this assembly, I am aware of Connecticut's failure to pace with the rapidly growing needs in higher education. We are not providing adequately for the great number of young people hoping to improve themselves through higher education. Our people and their ability are Connecticut's greatest resource. To provide our young people the opportunity to develop the full powers of their minds and talents is both a humanitarian goal and an economic necessity. This legislation creates a commission for higher education and provides for three vital needs services. First, the commission

June 8, 1965

119

will coordinate planning for the growth of our higher education system and furnish objective information and advice for the assembly. Second, it offers, at last, a sensible method of arbitrating disputes among those responsible for the different aspects of public higher education. Third, it will create a state system of community colleges. The need for these colleges has been widely recognized. Now, we can be sure that they will be created where they are most needed, and will be developed according to high standards. Due to the efforts of our late Senator Frank DiLoreto, it was my privilege to have a part in the great work performed by the dedicated working citizens who prepared the study commission report on which this legislation is based. I trust that their devoted efforts and excellent work will not have been in vain; and I ask you a favorable action on this bill that will do so much for the future of our Connecticut youth.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

The recent decision of the Supreme Court notwithstanding, the education committee, feel very strongly that the population explosion has provided, both the state board of education and Commissioner Sanders with many, many tasks to do, and increased responsibility in the fields of elementary and secondary education. I tried to indicate before that I would like to iterate that it certainly was not the feeling of any of the members of the

June 8, 1965

120

education committee, nor of the members of the commission on higher education to have this bill taken in any way as being a reflection of the performance of the board of commissioners. The state colleges have enjoyed fantastic growth. I would attribute that, not only to the direction of board of Commissioner Sanders, but to two greatest democratic administrations. I feel very strongly it would have been foolhardy for us to integrate and coordinate any system of higher education without taking all of these important parts and putting it under one great planning commission. There are many people who for a long time have felt that the state colleges deserved an indistinguishable which was a separate one. Thanks to this commission, we are able to accomplish two things in one indistinguishable. I would like, too, to underscore something that Senator Tansley said. Senator thanked DiLoreto, he has left many wonderful memories behind him. May I also say that he has a building named in his honor, a memorial to him, living memorials to him; none of these is this bill presented by the commissioner on higher education.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bliss.

SENATOR BLISS:

Mr. President, unless the remarks from the Senator from the twelfth, while I was emasculated from opinion in the Chair be construed as opposition on my part, I would say that I am in general opposed to any educational function of the state that becomes a hierarchy under a political head. However, I grant

June 8, 1965

121

that there is great benefit in this proposal. I call your attention to the fact that in my district, the twenty-sixth, we have the first community college; and in the last session of my legislation has provided a grant of degrees in that college. But, at the same time, I should say that the late Frank DiLoreto did talk to me at length about the question of the development of community colleges, and it was his wish that they be paced a little more in quality and kept, shall I say on a par with the best hopes in education in the state. At one time, he expressed the opinion, that they not get ready for degrees. So I am glad to see that the development under community colleges has been placed under the general supervision of the total state's plan. I am very much in favor of the bill. It is a forward step, and any feelings that I have had have been considerably tempered by the quality of the remarks of the Senators supporting it.

THE CHAIRMAN:

Further remarks? The question then is on passage of the bill. All those in favor say "aye", "opposed". The bill is passed.

I have been told by the people operating the machines that we have the same problem that we had before. The sound in back of the room is coming forward. Unless, we have further cooperation, we are going to ask that the rule be strictly enforced. Those people not authorized in the floor of the Senate will actually have to go out.

THE CLERK:

H 81

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
FEB. SPEC. SESSION
1965

VOL. 11, PART 6
JUNE 2 - JUNE 4
2669 - 3222

328.2s
C76pr
h
Leg. Ref.
Vault 3

CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY

Page 114

Friday, June 4, 1905

THE SPEAKER:

The Lady from Litchfield.

MRS. LESTER:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MRS. LESTER:

This bill merely eliminates the inclusion of the long notice of a naturalized and derivative citizenship requirements in the monthly notice of sessions for admission of electors. When the sessions were held only on Saturdays before an election, these notices might have been necessary, but with the monthly sessions now required the committee felt this requirement is no longer necessary. This is a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Hearing no further remarks, all in favor please say "aye", opposed? The bill is carried.

THE SPEAKER:

Calendar No. 962, File No. 1031, Substitute for House Bill No. 4719, An Act Establishing a State System of Higher Education. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Farmington.

MR. NOYES:

Page 115

Friday, June 4, 1965

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. NOYES:

Mr. Speaker, the day that this bill becomes effective will be a great day for education in Connecticut. It's a dynamic departure in public education in this state, it's a bold venture which is not for the timid, but it is a bill which those wholeheartedly committed to excellence in education in Connecticut can support without reservation. First, as to the need for the bill, at the present time the higher education establishment in Connecticut totals about 35,000 students in colleges and costs in the neighborhood of \$50 million per year to the state. This establishment as you now know is under the direction of the State Board of Education which also has the half million elementary and secondary school pupils under its supervision. There is no authority at the present time to coordinate the various elements of the higher education establishment. What is needed and what this bill supplies is the authority for coordination and planning without interfering with or interrupting the sensible administration of those individuals units which is now taking place and going on day to day. I shall limit myself entirely to commenting on the budgetary authority conferred in this bill and then yield to the Gentleman from Warren, whose

Page 116

Friday, June 4, 1965

Education Committee should take the credit for having worked out the bill subsequent to the report of the Governor's Commission on that subject. I call your attention in particular to section 6 of the bill which has to do with the appropriation procedure to be followed by the constituent units of the higher education commission, consisting of the University, the State Colleges and the Community Colleges. They will submit their individual budgets to the Commission for Higher Education, which in turn shall report those individual budgets in their entirety and an overall budget to this General Assembly. Secondly, in section 6 there is the authority for the constituent units to transfer funds appropriated by the General Assembly for their most effective or efficient use. The Republican budget includes an amount of \$210,434 for the administration of the Commission on Higher Education. It also includes a sum of \$1,960,000 for the acquisition and administration of existing community colleges. And I call particularly to your attention the fact that the bill before us repeals the existing authorities for local Boards of Education to start individual community colleges. Henceforth, such colleges can only be located, started, accredited and administered as the Commission for Higher Education may direct. This is an enormous step forward in trying to provide exactly what the Gentleman from East Hartford was referring to a moment ago. Excellent education at the lowest possible cost to the citizens of Connecticut who need it and can profit from it. This

Page 117

Friday, June 4, 1965

community college provision of the bill, which provides that any post secondary school can apply to the Higher Education Commission to be taken over and supported by the state within the limits of appropriations provided is one which will give those community colleges the kind of support and stature which they need (inaudible) to catch up with the tidal wave of students. And finally, I only call your attention to the fact that by 1975 just 10 years away, our college population in Connecticut will virtually double what it was in 1960 just five years ago. This kind of step which we are taking in this bill is what has desperately been needed here in Connecticut. I now yield to the Gentleman from Warren.

MR. ROBERTS OF BARKHAMSTED IN THE CHAIR

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Warren.

MR. LAGROTTA:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This is indeed, I think, an historic moment for this state before this House, and certainly for the Education Committee. This is the end, or maybe it's just the beginning, of a saga that began two years ago. This is a bi-partisan effort developed by members of the Education Committee from both sides of the aisle. One of the members who was the prime mover in this area has been taken from us. Senator Frank DiLoretto and myself, with the consent of the Governor, developed a study because we could see this crisis

Page 118

Friday, June 4, 1965

developing in higher education. After two years of study, which was done by a team of experts from Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, after numerous meetings of a very fine commission, presently company excluded, of which I had the honor of being a member, as well as the Gentleman from Madison and the Lady from Rocky Hill, as well as Senators Verriker, Hammer, DiLorretto, McCarthy and Schaeffer. We labored perhaps 18 months after we were started, had numerous meetings, and what we have before you today is a bill composed of 46 sections. This has been through the fire of discussion and debate, not only among the members of the commission, among the members of the profession, among outside members interested in education. There have been agreements and disagreements, there has been study. We have taken what the team of experts from Washington directed or indicated we should do, and the commission assimilated their findings, took some of them which we thought were adaptable for Connecticut, did not take some of the others. We tried in essence, in a simple manner, to give to this state's education system what it needed. I think nothing would have disturbed us more than to have tried to superimpose some structure of higher education here that might confuse, disturb and upset the present fine work that is being done presently by the component parts of our higher education system. The study indicated, among other things, that we, the legislature, people in general have been derelict in meeting our obligations to higher education. It also indicated very

Page 119

Friday, June 4, 1965

clearly the fact that there was splintered authority in the overall planning of higher education, was to be corrected. What we have tried to do in developing this bill is to add to our system what is needed, but using the old Yankee adage of not throwing away anything that is good but adding to it that which is needed. And what you have before you today is a bill which brings forward the necessity and develops the coordination which is necessary, the overall planning which is deemed necessary, and the structure devised so that we can have some evaluation of what is being done. Presently many of our institutions are so engaged in the operation of their particular function that they do not have the time to really sit down and plan. This structure that we have developed is meant to be an administrative function. This is to be a commission composed of 16 members as a liaison between the three component parts, and their functions will be primarily to organize, plan, ascertain the needs. Presently, under our system each of our component parts, the University on the one side and the four State Colleges on the other, each take what students they can accommodate and they do a fine job with those that they can accommodate. The real concern that we feel on the education committee, and I know that the commission in studying this felt that its concern, is what happens to the children that are not being accepted by these colleges. Through the years the requirements to enter our higher education schools has become increasingly more difficult. The result being that

Page 120

Friday, June 4, 1965

presently they are only taking somewhere around 35%, the top 35% of the graduating class. What we have left is 65% of the high school graduating class, and slowly we are building up a vast pool of young people who should have what education they can absorb and are willing to make the effort to attain. This is an obligation we owe these people, not only for them but for the state. Because our resources here are our people. Connecticut does not have any great natural resources except its natural beauty. We have no oil wells, or great coal mines or great stands of timber, waving wheat fields. All we have is people, and we must get the most from the people that we have. If we do not move and educate everyone who wishes to be educated to the utmost of his ability, somewhere along the line, particularly in this lower 65% of the graduating class, we will need these people. We will meet them somewhere, either on the welfare rolls or perhaps in the courts or in jail. This is an investment that we have to make, and the best possible method of moving into this crisis at the moment seems to be in the expansion of our present facilities and in an immediate expansion of a system of community colleges in an orderly manner. This bill sets up the structure by which we can attain a sensible, organized, planned operation for our higher education community. What has to go with it will be the funds to make this a reality. While it is the end, perhaps for some of the study commissions who have worked on this bill for nearly two years and brought it before you for your

Page 121

Friday, June 4, 1965

most serious consideration, to some degree it is a beginning for us all, because we are going to be involved for the next x number of years with people. And somehow as the government of this state in this one building, where we are government of 2½ million people, somehow we must provide a facility which reaches out and touches the lives of these young people, inspires them to walk a little straighter, to hold their head a little higher, to enjoy a life of endeavor and accomplishment, and not be considered drop-outs or having no place to go, and unwanted, and having a hostile and unhappy and unwanted attitude toward society. I think this is a real breakthrough. I am thrilled and delighted to have contributed even a fraction to this. The good Lady from Rocky Hill was most helpful, the Gentleman from Madison was most objective, and I know that he will want to speak on this, and I do not want to take more time. But I do feel that this is an historic moment. And I will tell you that on the study commission we had one fine lady by the name of Sister Mary Theodore from St. Joseph's, and she was the most objective and the most excited person that finally we are moving out with an organized and developed plan to touch the lives of as many of these young people as we can. I think this is a fine bill, and I'm happy and pleased that we can act on it today.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Meriden.

Page 122

Friday, June 4, 1965

MR. SHEA:

Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to stand and support this bill which is before the House today. Certainly the people of the state of Connecticut should consider this a banner day and a banner year in the educational history of our state. We in Connecticut who have been proud of our public educational system can certainly look forward as a result of the passage of this legislation to even further improvements in placing Connecticut in the forefront of the states of the Union in regard to the education of our youth. I think it was particularly fitting that the Gentleman from Warren remarked and mentioned the great and valued service that the late Senator Frank DiLoretto gave to this commission and to the people of his state in relation to this bill which is finally here today. I would also like to congratulate all of the members of the commission who have served their state so well, who have spent so much of their time in working on the problems of looking ahead to the needs of higher education in Connecticut, and I naturally must include in that the work that the Gentleman from Warren has done. All of us in this House are proud of the work that he has done as a representative of us and of the other members of this commission. It's a good bill. I'm delighted to see it here today and I hope it passes by a large majority.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Norwalk.

Page 123

Friday, June 4, 1965

MR. PADULA:

Once every two or three sessions in the legislature there comes before us a bill with bipartisan support which does such a good job for the state of Connecticut and for all of its people that it kind of sheds an aura on both sides of the aisle of this General Assembly. Such a bill is the one that we are considering today. It sets up a system of higher education in our state whereby our great university and our excellent State Colleges will complement each other, not compete with one another. It sets up a framework of a statewide system of community colleges to supplement the University's four-year colleges. It is a long step toward placing Connecticut in that position of leadership in higher education she so richly deserves. The bill was conceived in the bipartisan commission to study the higher education needs of Connecticut. It was born in the bipartisan Joint Committee on Education and received their joint favorable report. It is now before us with a joint favorable report from the Appropriations Committee. This is the kind of a bill which, when we vote for it, will cost each member of this House to stand just a little bit taller. This is the kind of bill which will give each one of us a little greater sense of pride in the fact that we hold a seat in this great House. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we didn't pass another thing in this session, but passed this bill and the budget, our time and our effort here would not have been in vain. I cannot too strongly

Page 124

Friday, June 4, 1965

urge the acceptance the committee's joint favorable report and the passage of this magnificent bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Woodstock.

MR. REYNOLDS:

Mr. Speaker, the time is long past when Connecticut should have established a system of higher education. But I am happy to see this bill before us today as a joint favorable report. I have been interested in this movement since the study commission gave their report edited by Ann Hogan of Putnam. I wish to extend my thanks to them and also to the Joint Committee of Education for coming out with this substitute bill. It is a substitute bill, you will notice. It is even better than the original bill. I have been somewhat concerned that the technical schools were not allowed to remain under the State Board of Education, but if as this bill suggests they and the community colleges can retain their individual status as under this bill I'll be happy to go along with it. And I spoke favorably for this bill at the hearing, and I am only too happy today to lend it my support.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Manchester.

MR. CAVAGNARO:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed. In fact, it is long overdue. Our greatest lack in higher education is in the devel-

Page 125

Friday, June 4, 1965

opment of our community colleges. Action by some concerned citizens and some local officials of Manchester, Norwalk and Winsted have given Connecticut the beginning of a community college system. But we are years behind the rest of the nation. We have not had the state level planning and leadership that we needed. The growth of community state colleges for our state should not be left to the accidents of local decision, with new colleges popping up almost anywhere with no statewide planning. Because of the vision and energy of a few people in my town, we have established Manchester Community College. But this is not a college for Manchester residents only. We have in our college students from 27 towns. Next year more than 50% of the students will come from our town. I am proud that my town has provided this leadership and that we are giving many youngsters a chance at higher education who might have been denied that chance. We want to be good neighbors and welcome the out of town student as well as the Manchester student to our college. But this is not a duty ~~of~~ the state should impose on any local community. This is a state responsibility, at least it ought to be. But until now this theory of higher education has been neglected at the state level. In this bill the General Assembly has the opportunity to say we want state leadership and state support for a system of regional community colleges. In this bill we have the means of providing state level planning and coordination for the growth of our higher education system. The bipartisan

Page 126

Friday, June 4, 1965

study commission has carried out the assignment given it by this Assembly. Now we have a bill that embodies most of the recommendations of that excellent report. We know what is needed. It's up to us to act. If we are going to see that Connecticut meets its responsibility towards the thousands of young high school graduates who will be looking for a chance to improve themselves. I say let's vote this bill and get on with the job.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Haddam.

MR. CARLSON:

I rise in support of the bill. I support the principles of the bill, but especially for my fellow legislators from Middlesex County I recommend section 40 of the bill on page 14. We in Middlesex County have been working for years to try to get a branch of the University in our area, and we had hoped this year. We had a bill in and it looked pretty good. But because of this study and this bill coming in they didn't feel it wise to bring in any separate section of a bill like that. So what has been put in is a statement that a special attention should be given to the areas that have recent completed studies which we have in Middlesex County. And if we are to get higher education in that area in the near future I feel that this is our only hope. So I hope all of you that supported a branch of the University in Middlesex County will support this bill.

Page 127

Friday, June 4, 1965

THE SPEAKER:

The Lady from Rocky Hill.

MRS. TRACY:

I rise in support of this bill. In the 1963 session this bill was passed after a bipartisan effort. We thought this was going to be, when it came out of this Assembly without money, another inside look at education in the state of Connecticut. However, the Governor had a very different idea. He picked a very able committee, Senator Lucy Hammer, Senator Verriker and of course Senator DiLorretto who had worked with Guy LaGroota on this bill. In the House he picked Guy LaGroota, Mr. Cairns and myself. The first day we assembled we were quite thrilled at the great choice he had made of the members who were to represent the University of Connecticut and the private colleges. With this very able committee, when we were assembled on the first day, the Governor told us that he would provide us with the money if we would go forward and make as much of a study as we could in higher education. After several meetings the Commission on Higher Education called upon a team of experts from the Health, Education and Welfare Department in Washington who would give us an outside look at our higher education in Connecticut, a team that had made a study in two other states like our own. After hearing the report and working with this committee and meeting with them continually for almost two years, we set about trying to solve what we thought were the problems.

Page 128

Friday, June 4, 1965

Although we were considering post secondary education in our state, somehow or other we have always considered the top 40% of a graduating class as the academically inclined. However, after very thorough study we fully realize now that in the lower 50% of the class there are children that are academically inclined and we as legislators have an obligation to educate them and try to have them find their place, which is in the academic field. We also hope in this session to make another great stride and that is in the area of the community college. We hope to leave this session with state aid to community colleges, that the children attending the community colleges, as has been explained by my colleague from Manchester, that they will be able to attend community colleges and get their education for the same fee as we are having in the state colleges. A great deal of effort and time has been put into this by both the Senators and the Representatives, by the public that represented us, by our great chairlady who never missed a meeting and gave a great deal of her time, Chairman Ann Hogan from Putnam. Indeed, we as legislators here today should give this bill our wholehearted support.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from West Hartford.

MR. BELDEN:

Mr. Speaker, as has been said before here today, this can well be a notable day in the record of Connecticut. Since the

Page 129

Friday, June 4, 1965

close of World War II educators and state officials have wrestled with the problem of higher education, and today we are closer to some tangible results than any time in the past 18 years. From my own experience on the Board of Trustees of the University, as a member of the liaison committee several years ago, I know the time and the effort and the frustrations that have gone into this. I merely want to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to compliment the commission that brought forth this. More particularly do I want to congratulate the Education Committee of this Assembly for bringing out a bill which is workable and acceptable. Not a perfect bill, I am sure. Not a bill that will not need some revision in time, but one which gets us off to the kind of a start that we should have made several years ago. And to them I pay my respects, and only say here now that every Assembly collects a number of pluses and minuses. Perhaps this Assembly having served longer than others will accumulate more of both. But I am sure that one of the real shining ones will be the enactment of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Berlin.

MR. DORAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to go on record in opposition to this bill. The laugh and the giggle is very correct. The steam roller is well on its way. This is a case of swimming against the tide. I've been in this position before, I'm not afraid of

Page 130

Friday, June 4, 1965

it, and sometimes I've changed the tide. I won't do it today, I'm sure, after what I've heard. But I would like to leave some thoughts on the record. First, perhaps I have been trained too long in industry. We have heard the sugar coated excuses for this separate commission on higher education. The magic words , higher education. They ring like a bell throughout the land. Why a separate commission? Because no one who has spoken today has the pure guts to say that the direction of higher education in our present department of education is being improperly handled. They won't admit this. I've asked it a dozen times. And I'd like to point out now that this is not a unanimous decision on the Education Committee. As I say, perhaps I've been trained too long in Industry, but if I had a department, and I know any industrial person would do this, that was not properly handling the area for which he is responsible, he would not create another monstrosity over here on the side to take care of the area that he thought wasn't being handled properly. He would go in and rectify the situation where it belonged. Now I don't know where the error is in our present Department of Education. I've explored it to the best of my limited ability, and I can't find it. It seems to rest in autonomy. The separate colleges that we have wish to have fiscal autonomy as well as autonomy to conduct their affairs as they see fit. Some of this undoubtedly has merit, but one of the arguments posed for this separate commission on higher education was that this

Page 131

Friday, June 4, 1965

would alleviate the Committee on Education in this House, keep them from having to hear all these separate complaints about budgets. I say to you, sir, and I think it's a prophecy, that instead, if this arrangement goes through, they will have chaotic budget requests coming from all angles. They will not come through a head as they should. Now much has been made of the community colleges and about the people who can't get into the colleges that we now have. The answer to that is relatively obvious to one working with organizations. Expand the existing system. Don't make a make believe college of two years that doesn't give a degree. If a town wishes to do this as Norwalk has done with their own finances, as they said at the hearing, very well, good for them. And Manchester, too. But don't ask the state to pick up the bill and expand this sort of thing. What is a youngster going to say who is going to a community college. "What degree have you got, Joe?" He hasn't even got a degree. The best they can give him is some associate certificate. I would like to finish by saying that there are other experts involved in this subject, people who have lived and breathed and worked with this thing for years. Mr. Horowitz, the Chairman of the State Board of Education, pleaded in vain for this bill not to come through. He, too, couldn't see why the existing State Board of Education and its commissioner appointed by our good Governor could not continue to control and watch over the education system that we have. It was not clear

Page 132

Friday, June 4, 1965

at all to him, and he's worked with this a long time.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Sprague.

MR. KELLY:

I would like to say first that I am in favor of this bill. When the original bill was heard on the Education Committee upon which I served, I viewed it with great reluctance and much misgiving. I think that the sub-committee who rewrote the bill removed some of the objections I had to it, like the gentleman on the other side of the House that said it wasn't a perfect bill. I don't think it's a perfect bill but as far as higher education is concerned it's certainly a long stride in the right direction. There are some other conditions that I didn't like. One was that I thought perhaps the State Board of Education is being degraded. Maybe that wasn't the intent of anyone, but I think the action rather implied that. And the fact that the Gentleman from Warren and his very fine presentation of why this bill should prevail, mentioned the fact that perhaps there was some little dereliction on the part of this House in previous sessions leading to the condition that we found higher education in and that needed a major injection of something or other. I wish it could have been done without degrading, if that's the proper word, the State Board of Education. But I believe, that with the acceptance of this bill, some future sessions of this legislature will carry the work on and we will have a very fine

Page 133

Friday, June 4, 1965

system of higher education.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Warren.

MR. LAGROTTA:

I rise not to debate the questions raised, but to speak to the fine work that the State Department of Education is doing. The latest development in education seems to be in pre-kindergarten training. The whole area of the curing of mental diseases seems to be moving into the areas where younger people are concerned. Very shortly, and I hope very quickly, we will be discussing the bill relative to disadvantaged children, the work that will have to be done for them. We have a Joint favorable on a \$10 million program in the next biennium to help the disadvantaged children of all races and colors so they can reach school on a par with other children. This is a vast program. This will take not only the program itself, but the training of teachers to administer to them.

MR. CROMBIE:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I believe we're talking on higher education, not on kindergarten children.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you confine your remarks to the subject, please?

MR. LAGROTTA:

I will, sir. I will just relate this matter, that the work of the State Department of Education is becoming so vast

Page 134

Friday, June 4, 1965

and will be becoming so much greater than what it has been, that the problem of higher education certainly needs a department which can take care of it by itself. This is in no way or measure, in any shape or form, any indication that the best has not been done according to their ability. But there is just about so much that any one department can do, and this is the point I wanted to make clear.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Berlin.

MR. DORAN:

Thanks to the distinguished Gentleman from Warren, I rise to speak a second time. Talking about the elementary education, the area in which our State Department of Education will now be relegated to as though in a separate world, I would like to remind those in this House who may have remembered President Griswold of Yale, whose chief concern was that the ability of his fine college to perform rested very, very terribly upon the equipment and the education that his students had received prior to entrance in his college, and his concern was that many of these students were almost illiterate in many respects. And this was because of not the high schools alone, but of the elementary schools before that. Now it should be obvious to anybody who's thinking in terms of a full and complete education for youngsters, including college people, with continuity to it that it must be controlled from one given head, and not separate elements thinking

Page 135

Friday, June 4, 1965

of this phase and another element thinking of that phase. That is the reason why I believe all of our education in this state should be controlled from one head.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Farmington.

MR. NOYES:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly for the second time, commenting on the remarks of the respected Democratic Gentleman from Berlin, I think that if he will refer to his industry experience, the idea of decentralization of subsidiary units, when of sufficient size, is a perfectly acceptable and fine management practice. I would suggest to him that the difficulty in the present arrangement is not that the Board of Education is not doing its job, as eloquently explained by the Gentleman from Warren, but that under the present system nobody had overall responsibility. The State Board had no control over the community colleges and no control over the University of Connecticut. It was no fault of their own that they didn't have it, but they didn't. And thirdly, with respect to the use of the word degraded, I find it very difficult to believe that a department which has the control and administration for the biennium of \$285 million, which is what will be left under the State Board of Education control is in any way degraded. It's a fairly substantial responsibility which they have. And lastly, I refer to the fact that the State Board at the present time is charged with, among

Page 136

Friday, June 4, 1965

other things, the adjudication of disputes which arise in local Boards of Education. And when the State Board of Education has to sit in judgement, whether the town of Southington or any other town is right or wrong in requiring students to walk a mile and a half or two miles, it seems perfectly obvious to me that they can't also run a higher educational institution which as I suggested in the first place amounted to 35,000 students and \$50 million.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Fairfield.

MR. FENNELL:

I believe this is a good bill, I hope it passes.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks upon the bill? If not, all those in favor of passage of Substitute House Bill 4719 please say "aye", those opposed? It's a pleasure for me to declare the bill passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 986, File No. 1059, House Bill No. 2608. An Act concerning the Transfer of Title of Certain Land inder Tidal Waters to the United States of America. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Federal and Intergovernmental Relations.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from Norwalk.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

EDUCATION

PART 2

375 - 775

**CONN.
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

1965

EDUCATION

623

MONDAY

APRIL 12, 1965

Senator Gloria Schaffer Presiding

Members Present: Senators: Schaffer, Carlson, Hammer.

Representatives: Hutton, LaGrotta, Blake
Morano, Reinhardsen, Bixler, Wesver,
Kirschner, Richards, Quirk, Rock, Ryan,
Diefenderfer, Fennell, Clark, Erb, Fellows,
Tracy, Doran, Moriarty, Rose, Caprio.

S.B. 1341 (Verriker, Schaffer, Hammer, McCarthy, DiLoreto)
H.B. 4719 (Cairns, Tracy, LaGrotta)

AN ACT ESTABLISHING A STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER
EDUCATION

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Might I ask you all to be seated?
There are copies of the bill that we are
hearing today on the table over on my left,
and there is also a sheet there on which
you may register your support or opposition
to the bill we're hearing today. We're
going to follow a slightly different proce-
dure today in running the hearing. There
are several so called organized groups, who
have a very definite interest in the comm-
ission report, and we will call them up as
entity, and ask them to speak and we will
then hear anyone else who wishes to speak
on the bill. We will open the hearing by
hearing the members of the Commission on
Higher Education speak on their proposal.
Senator William Verriker will introduce the
chairman of the Commission.

Sen. William Verriker: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name
is William Verriker, state senator from the
15th district. Senator Schaffer, Representa-
tive LaGrotta, members of the Education Comm-
ittee. The legislation before you this morn-
ing is the culmination of many months of work
by a group of conscientious citizens, who have
performed an excellent service for the Gener-
al Assembly, and for the people of Connecti-
cut.

Sen. William Verriker, cont'd:

624

For many years, members of this Legislature have brought to hand of objective evaluation to the State's needs in higher education. We have, of course, received recommendations from each one of the public colleges, and the State University, and in recent years, the State Institutes, (technical). The various proposals for more expenditures, for more construction, for more staff, for more facilities created a situation which the different higher education institutions of the State were in competition for the tax dollar. Two years ago, your Committee initiated some constructive action to change this system. To put planning for higher education on a basis that would satisfy not political strength, but educational needs. After thoughtful discussion, you raised a resolution for a commission that would conduct a deliberate, careful analysis of various problems in the area of higher education. This resolution had bi-partisan support in this committee, and received bi-partisan support when it was approved on the floor of each House. This same spirit was reflected in the appointments to the Commission, and in the more than 35 working sessions of that hard working body, I confess I felt proud to be privileged to serve in this Commission, and to have had a part in preparing the valuable recommendations made in the report presented to the Governor, and to the General Assembly. Now, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am especially conscious of the need of legislators for more and better information, for objective evaluation of our current and future needs if we are to achieve the most effective use of facilities, and make the widest distribution of public funds. Each session, my committee must make decisions among competing proposals for vast expenditures. None of these decisions are easy, and no legislator can every be certain he has enough knowledge of all of the problems. In this session, and in future sessions, there will be proposals for greatly increased expenditures, to give our young people the opportunity they should have to advance themselves through higher education. I believe that the State of Connecticut should do more toward meeting those obligations to future generations. But in voting for such proposals, in recommending such expenditures, I believe that this legislature should have the recommendations and information necessary for us to make intelligent choices. I mean no disrespect for the fine men who carry the responsibility

Sen. William Verricker, cont'd:

625

for operating our existing institutions for higher education. But it is only human nature that we are inclined to give more importance to our own needs than we give to the needs of another area or another institution. The General Assembly must make decisions for the whole state and should have recommendations from a body that is concerned with the total needs of the state. The bill before you provides this for us. Much study preceded the Report that is the basis for this bill. A talented, experienced research team from the U. S. Office of Education spent many weeks in our state, reviewing our needs, interviewing college and university administrators, visiting our institutions, and analyzing our problems. They gave the Study Commission detailed reports on each aspect of these problems in higher education. After examining these reports and intensive questioning of the experts who prepared them, the Study Commission members bent to their final task of determining the course that seemed best for the State of Connecticut. Their report of this important study, Mr. Chairman, deserves the careful, and I hope favorable, consideration of this Committee. Many people contributed to the work of the Study Commission. They are all honored, I am sure, to have played a part in this work. I am most pleased this morning to have the honor of introducing to this Committee the gentlelady who guided our deliberations and brought so many strong, diverse minds so close to unanimity in our final report. She is a dedicated citizen who has devoted her life to the cause of education, the Study Commission Chairman, Miss Anne Hogan of Putnam.

Miss Anne Hogan: Thank you, Senator Verricker. It was certainly a pleasure to work with you and the other dedicated people who were on this Commission. I wish I could convey to you the tremendous sense of urgency which I feel--the immediate necessity for the enacting of the provisions of this bill which is designed to advance Connecticut not only educationally but economically. Believe me, during the twenty months we have worked on this Commission, our sole intent has been to bring into being a system of higher education that would be the best for the State of Connecticut and its citizens. Senator Verricker spoke of the experienced men from the U. S. Office of Education who did the research and collected the information that is the foundation of our report.

Miss Anne Hogan, cont'd:

626

When these people were first contacted, they advised us they would furnish the specially trained research men for each area of study. These men were to report to their study director through working papers which would be the groundwork for his recommendations for higher education in Connecticut, and when the work was concluded, we would be given the complete reports. Our Commission was not satisfied with this method; it made us too remote from the study. It seemed to us that unless we knew the why as well as the what, we could not fully evaluate any summary given us. And so, for the first time in its history, the U. S. Office of Education permitted a state's commission to work along with it step by step. As each working paper was completed, a copy was sent to each member of the commission. After the commission members studied each report (which were up to 100 pages long), that research group came to our meeting to explain each step and to answer our questions--questions based on our personal research as well as the working paper. Therefore, when we received the final summary, conclusion, and recommendations, we had a firm background on which to evaluate its application to Connecticut. Those of you who had time to read Dr. Stout's report as well as ours will recognize that we did not adopt it in toto. We rejected the recommendation of a powerful Board of Regents represented by a Chancellor who had to concern himself with the details of each institution, since there would be no trustee. We felt this was not in keeping with Connecticut's traditions. We recommend that each of the three branches of higher education needed trustees to retain its identity and grow in its own unique way. We want the University of Connecticut to continue its progress toward becoming one of the great state universities in the country--and we know, under its present administration, it can be. We want each state college to have its own individual excellence, to be outstanding in its own right. And our technical schools are known throughout the country, and modelled for this kind of training. This is the technical institutes on the collegiate level. We agreed that there was a present need for a new 12-man, impartial Commission for Higher Education, appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the General Assembly, and that this new Commission should appoint an executive officer to carry out its work. This Commission would be responsible for the planning, coordination, and

Miss Anne Hogan, cont'd:

627

organization of Connecticut's public-supported program of higher education. However, the daily operations of the institutions should be the prerogative of the respective schools. So, in this bill, it is recommended that the University of Connecticut retain its trustees, that the four state colleges have one board of trustees (since all four are designed to serve the needs of the entire state), and that the two year institutions--the community colleges and the technical institutions also have a board of trustees; and that the community colleges could have local advisory boards to help them better serve the area needs for education. In our research we studied the projections of the University of Connecticut and the four state colleges, and the technical institutes. With additional funds, it is true that they plan to expand their facilities to permit more students to enter their institutions. But nowhere in these plans for high school graduates were there opportunities for higher education for those in the lower half of the graduating class. Moreover, with the current population growth in Connecticut, these institutions are not now accepting many high school graduates who five or six years ago would have qualified for admission. These high school graduates have no public institutions for higher education available to them in Connecticut. They must either pay higher tuition at private institutions, or join the ranks of unskilled labor. In 1940 unskilled labor jobs were open to approximately 35% of the employed. In 1950, the labor market could absorb only 25% who were unskilled. In 1960, only 15% of those employed in the United States could be classified as unskilled labor. With the tremendous strides automation has made, it is possible that right now not more than 10% of available jobs are open to unskilled labor. So where are the lower 50% of the high school graduating classes to turn? Secretary of Labor Wirtz has aptly said that we have only this choice--we can pay to educate them or we can support them on relief rolls. And it is to this group of high school graduates that we dedicate a new part of our third branch of higher education, the area community colleges. These can furnish, at the same low tuition as is available to Connecticut residents at the University and the four state colleges, the first two years of college for those whose interests and abilities will permit this transfer education, and give terminal education for business occupations, technicians, service employment, etc. Coordination of higher educa-

Miss Anne Hogan, cont'd:

628

tion under one commission will enable those who qualify to transfer to the University or state colleges for their third and fourth years. It can prevent duplication of collegiate offerings where they are unnecessary, and assure needed courses in every geographic area. The expense of education is large in money--but not in human values--the extra earning power of a college graduate will return to the state in taxes alone the entire cost of his education. We must make the best and fullest use of all resources: plant and equipment, research materials and share expensive or rare materials with all branches of public higher education and with private colleges as well. This is part of the work that can be done by this coordinating board. The governing board of each constituent unit of the state system of higher education would prepare its budget proposal and submit such proposed budget to the Commission for Higher Education. The Commission would review the budgets and present to the Governor and the General Assembly one itemized budget for a coordinated program of higher education for the State, which should relieve some pressure on your legislators. The governing body of each institution could determine the allocation of these funds for the operation and maintenance of the programs and activities of that unit. And we are very conscious of our find private colleges which, for generations, furnished the only higher education available to Connecticut residents. We know that many high school graduates will continue to prefer to matriculate at these outstanding private colleges in and out of our state. But, even if the cost were not high, the limitations placed on enrollment at these institutions preclude their taking in all the Connecticut students not admitted to public institutions. It is suggested that an advisory council, consisting of representatives of both private and public institutions work together for an enriched educational environment for the citizens of our state. These private and public college people might work together in determining new sources of funds for private institutions, for a system of student loans, uniform student-teacher training programs, the sharing of rare and expensive materials. I hope this statement has conveyed to you our sincere belief in the need for the new and immediate system of higher education in Connecticut, and why we are urging the speedy passage of this bill that this work may start at once.

Miss Anne Hogan, cont'd: I would like to, at this time, introduce Mr. Ellis Maxcy, President of the Southern New England Telephone Company, and a member of this Commission, who will present some of his views on the bill. Our vice chairman, Mr. Ellis Maxcy.

Mr. Ellis C. Maxcy: Madam chairman, Mr. LaGrotta, ladies and gentlemen. I think it's fair to say that Connecticut has been unusually fortunate in its educational development. Its Boards and its educators have taken many substantial forward steps. This has been good for the state and good for education. Connecticut's educational problems are accelerating at a very rapid pace at all levels. We need to assure educational opportunity to its youth and adults to the limit of their ability and interest. This effort also can be fundamental to the state's economic progress and the provision of adequate job opportunities. There is a genuine need under these circumstances for the creation of an agency for the planning and coordination of higher education. In performing this function, it is important that it be done in such a way that it will promote the inherent and distinctive characteristics of the state institutions of higher education and retain their management initiative. Also, Connecticut's public higher education problems cannot be looked at in isolation. As has been said, we have many fine institutions within the state which contribute to meeting student needs and add much to Connecticut's good educational climate. Also, some of our higher education students will choose to study outside our state and others from outside will wish to come here. Study and planning is much needed in the Community College category. The success of this type of institution in this state and elsewhere offers a valuable potential to Connecticut's educational program. In order to live up to its educational obligations and to provide the education needed for modern, economic development, Connecticut needs to plan and organize for the job. I see the objective of the Commission on Higher Education as being for just that purpose. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Mr. Maxcy.

Miss Anne Hogan: Thank you, Ellis. Mr. Sterling Tooker, chairman of, excuse me, president of Traveler's Insurance Company, and a member of our Commission has been in Texas, and he has sent me a statement which I would like to read to you:

Mr. Sterling Tooker's Statement:

Mr. Sterling Tooker's Statement: (read by Miss Anne Hogan)

While it is not possible for me to appear, in person, to support HB 4719, I do hope the Committee will accept this written statement as urging its passage in the 1965 Session of the General Assembly. In general, my views are those contained in the report to you of the Commission on Higher Education, dated Feb. 1965. I believe this report, and its supporting studies, amply demonstrate the need for a reorganization of the state's public education structure in furthering the stated purposes of Connecticut's institutions of higher education. While my supplemental statement to that report summarizes my reasons for believing that the reorganization which is before us in this hearing does not go far enough in concentrating the planning for all the state's public education activities, I do urge legislation which goes at least as far as this bill suggest at this time. It is not my intent to rehearse with you all of the documented reasons which our Commission has caused, at your request, to be printed and presented to you for implementation. May I simply list for you the conclusions and principles which, to me, are persuasive of immediate action:

- 1) Connecticut's economic future is completely dependent on its ability to generate more than its share of unique, human skills. This has been its tradition - it must be accelerated. We have almost no natural resources with which to perpetuate our enviable competitive position. The need for an unusual degree of educational competence is not primarily on of "social justice" or "doing our share" - rather it is a real, hard-headed economic necessity of and for our state.
- 2) Connecticut's support of public higher education falls far short of present and future requirements by any forecast or competitive test that has been recorded.
- 3) There are, of course, many reasons set forth to explain our present predicament. Most of these are, in fact, contributing elements - each bearing its share of responsibility. But it is to the future -- and not to the past -- that we must direct our attention. There are those who expect that the availability of more state funds provided to our existing institutions will permit the state of Connecticut to meet the future challenges of higher education effectively. If the sources of our funds were limitless, I am sure there would be some truth to this contention, since it is clear that the future will require this greatly-expanded state expenditure. But

Mr. Sterling Tooker's Statement, cont'd:

- our resources - although great - are not limitless, and we must give careful attention to the effectiveness of the augmented support we propose for higher education. In my opinion, this is the most persuasive argument in support of the reorganization proposed in this legislation. It is important that an entirely new State entity continually plan our higher education needs, evaluate the performance of our institutions, and distribute the State's tax support in the most objective and effective manner possible.
- 4) In the absence of a state agency which is continually responsible for the development of a higher education blueprint, charged also with the responsibility of modifying this long-term plan as often as maintenance of an effective higher education entity requires, the Governor and the General Assembly, of necessity, will be required on many occasions in reconstitute study commissions similar to our current Commission on Higher Education. The state should not be in a position which requires it to support spasmodic studies.
 - 5) With respect to the specific provisions of the bill, I would offer only two thoughts:
 - a) It is desirable that the powers of the Commission for Higher Education should be sufficiently broad to provide flexibility in dealing with changing conditions that may evolve over the years.
 - b) In Sections 22 and 28, it would seem appropriate that the appointment of the trustees by the Governor be made "upon the recommendation of the Commission on Higher Education."

Again, I regret that it is not possible for me to appear in person and express the urgent need for the passage of this bill.

Miss Anne Hogan: Next we have Mr. Frazar Wilde, who is chairman of the Board of The Connecticut General Life Insurance and member of the Commission on Higher Education. Unfortunately Mr. Wilde is not here to be heard in person, but he has sent a statement which will now be read by Mr. Henry Dawes.

Statement of Frazar B. Wilde, (read by Mr. Henry Dawes)

Madam chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee. It is a source of deep regret that I am unable to appear before you to add my testimony on behalf of the report of the Commission on Higher Education. The problem of education

Statement of Frazar B. Wilde, cont'd:

in our country and in the state of Connecticut is so large and so complex today that conventional, historical approaches will not do. Almost overnight a complicated and advancing civilization has required us to furnish education facilities of extraordinary breadth and depth. Educational demands and needs no longer start at the kindergarten level. Pre-kindergarten and nursery levels, today mostly served by private sources, will enter the public domain. We have in addition to a broader curriculum in the elementary schools a very large need for specialization. Slow readers and handicapped children are but two of the examples. The expansion and extension of various technical and vocational facilities are well known. Higher education no longer stops at the conventional degrees. All kinds of post-graduate degrees are widely sought and needed. If we are to meet such a complex and such a rapidly growing series of problems, we have to have an organization substantially removed from daily operational requirements. It is not practical or realistic to expect the present institutions, whether the universities, the colleges or the present training schools - not to mention the elementary areas - to function adequately in carrying out their presently assigned jobs and at the same time successfully plan for the future. This is the genesis and fundamental meaning of the Commission's report. The concern of the present institutions that an overall body will interfere with their responsibility and their execution is not justified if the legislation is properly drawn. An overall body would be dedicated to forward-looking planning and would maintain liaison among our present and future institutions and see that there is no overlapping. It would also allocate the total funds appropriated by the legislature fairly and rationally in accordance with an objective valuation of the needs of the state. Let us hope that Connecticut will enact legislation substantially in the form recommended so that our State can move from its present status to a reputation and a performance which will justify its being called one of the very best. Minor aspects of the Commission's plan can be modified but it is vital that the basic idea be accepted and implemented by the proper legislation. Thank you on behalf of Mr. Wilde.

Miss Anne Hogan:

Thank you, Mr. Dawes, and convey our thanks also, please, to Mr. Wilde. Mr. Merlin Bishop, University of Connecticut trustee, and a representative of Labor, as well as a member of our commission has had a great deal to do with the progress of our report. May I now introduce Mr. Merlin Bishop?

Mr. Merlin D. Bishop: Madam chairman, Mr. LaGrotta, and members of the Education Committee. I congratulate your committee for the expeditious way you have moved to implement the recommendations of the Study Commission on Higher Education. Those recommendations were the result of 18 months of study which cost the taxpayers \$50,000. The Commission read and discussed volumes of background material and reports before arriving at its conclusions. SB 1341 and HB 4719 are concrete evidence that your committee is seriously interested in implementing our recommendations. In a letter to your chairman, I have suggested changes in the bills which would more nearly conform to the Commission's recommendations. I won't take your time to repeat them here, except to emphasize that it was not the intent of the Study Commission that the proposed Commission should usurp any of the administrative functions of the higher educational institutions, except in the handling of budget requests and supplementing institutional planning. I'd like to now turn to a gap in our higher education structure which is revealed by our study which is my major concern. Our study shows that Connecticut is doing nothing for the ordinary High School graduate. I refer to the thousands of youngsters whose academic record in high school put them in the lower 50% of their graduation class. The University of Connecticut has always required that the applicant be from the upper 40% of his class. In recent years, thanks largely to the lack of sufficient funds, the University trustees have also required that the applicant pass the College Board tests. The Connecticut Colleges, and even the technical institutes, require that the applicant be in the upper 50% of his high school graduating class. Therefor, I repeat that the State of Connecticut has made absolutely no provision for public post-high school education for the thousands of youngsters, many of them "late bloomers", who cannot meet the arbitrary enrollment ceilings set by existing State institutions of higher education. This is a tragic oversight which cries for solution. The bills under consideration today would provide for the ultimate establishment of a state-wide system of Community Colleges, the primary purpose of which would be provided both academic and vocational-technical education for those who are unable to gain admission at the private and public four-year institutions. I strongly urge that you act favorably on these legislative proposals. To implement this and other recommendations of the Study Commission will require the expenditure of large sums of money.

Mr. Merlin D. Bishop, cont'd:

634

The Connecticut taxpayers must be made to understand that there are no barbain basement prices for the sound successful educational system. Failure to act would be much more costly to the taxpayers and to the economy of the state. If we don't spend more tax monies for higher education, we will surely be obliged to spend greater sums for law enforcement agencies, prisons and relief agencies. And if you don't know what I mean, just read the report of Mayor Wagner, requiring a policeman on every subway in the City of New York, or the report of your Youth Commission here the other day. The dilemma we face is due partly to the post-war bumper crop of babies but is primarily due to the changes which the modern technological revolution is bringing to our society. Modern technology now affords the opportunity to create a society of abundance; the human and social sciences must provide free men and their institutions with the moral and social purpose to equal the progress we are achieving in the physical sciences. Connecticut is one of the wealthiest states in the Union. We rank third from the top in per capita wealth. We rank third from the bottom of the fifty states in our per capita expenditure for higher education. In the long-run, we will be judged, not by our material wealth or our productive resources, but rather by the social and moral responsibility we exercise to convert material wealth into human values and technical progress into human progress, human happiness, and the opportunities of individual fulfillment. We simply must find a way to meet the social needs resulting from the rapid pace of technological innovation; otherwise, we will suffer a terrible and tragic waste of our most precious resource, our human resource. This would be most costly to the state's economy; but even more tragic would be the personal defeat which many of our young people could suffer in the crucial years of adulthood when the attitudes and disciplines of a lifetime are being forged. I trust that you will act courageously and with dispatch to enact, and implement, legislation in this session of the General Assembly in order that this does not happen in Connecticut. Thank you.

Miss Anne Hogan: Thank you, Merlin. Our next speaker is Mrs. Katherine Bourn, chairman of the Manchester Board of Education, and member of this Commission, who has been associated with the community college for a number of years. Mrs. Bourn --

Mrs. Katherine Bourn: Senator Schaffer, Representative LaGrotta, and ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this Committee to support these bills which are of such vital concern to the educational welfare of our state. My experience in education, and especially as a member of the Study Commission, has made me aware of the urgent need for the proposed Commission to give impetus and direction to the entire system of higher education here in Connecticut. I would like to express unqualified support of those aspects of the bill dealing with Community Colleges. Manchester is the second municipality in the state to establish a community college in order to provide educational opportunities for those students who do not have access to other institutions. Our experience in initiating such a venture has provided valuable information about the need for this kind of institution and about the difficulties encountered when a town or city tries to finance such a college independently. Although there are a few who would leave the responsibility for providing this needed educational service solely on the doorstep of the individual community I do not feel that new community colleges can be created in the areas in which they are most needed without state support. Often the geographical areas with the most pressing needs are not large metropolitan or wealthy suburban sections, and as such have limited financial resources. As you know, Manchester can be considered more fortunate than many towns in Connecticut and yet we have been forced to use the High School buildings for all our classes. Thus the college can function only after high school hours, or when the facilities are not otherwise being used. This obviously places severe restrictions on our program. It is not possible for small rural towns to support adequately a comprehensive community college or technical institute program. Yet students throughout the state who cannot afford to live away from home deserve the opportunity to attend two years of college at a location within commuting distance of their homes. As you know, Manchester is about to receive from the Federal Government a large and attractive site, formerly a Nike site, on which to develop our college. There are well-constructed buildings which need only to be remodeled to make it possible for the college to use this marvelous site in September, 1966. We need the state's help, however, to make the buildings usable. Besides the financial backing the state also has much to contribute in the way of shared equipment and other services that would be of inestimable benefit to the local communities.

Mrs. Katherine Bourn, cont'd:

636

Local interests are safeguarded in the proposed bills by the provision for a regional council for each community college to advise the Board of Trustees in matters of policy and budget. This council would be a vital influence in the formulation of plans. The Trustees will be highly motivated to solicit and adopt the recommendations of such councils so that regional needs can be reconciled with state policy in a satisfactory manner. From our experience with a local two-year college I would like to assure you that these institutions do not have to adopt lower standards than those currently accepted as "college level" in order to accomplish their aim of admitting all qualified applicants. I feel that these colleges must rightly accept all applicants who can benefit from advanced study, yet this admission policy does not dictate lower educational standards. The standards may be different -- just as the programs offered may be different -- but they need not be lower. We have found that the faculty is highly instrumental in determining standards. Manchester Community College has on its faculty many highly qualified educators whose backgrounds and abilities are superior in many instances to those of the staff members available to freshmen and sophomore students at many four-year institutions. In Connecticut today we know that many students who are capable of achieving greater success through receiving a post-secondary education cannot attend any existing state institution. It will grow increasingly true in the future that a high school education will be insufficient preparation for most available jobs. Central Connecticut College has already made it known that they will have to turn down 3000 applicants this spring. Where will these students, who have certainly indicated their desire to continue their education, go in September? Can they all afford the only remaining alternative-- private colleges? Can existing private colleges accommodate them? This bill provides for joining the interests of community colleges with technical institutes. Since the entire concept of community colleges rests on their obligation to serve the needs of their locality, the colleges must be prepared to present any needed technical programs. Although the content of the courses in separate programs may vary widely as well as the facilities, the goals of each of these programs are highly compatible. Community Colleges should not be regarded as com-

Mrs. Katherine Bourn, cont'd:

637

peting with existing state and private colleges and universities, but rather as being dedicated to the creation of opportunities in currently neglected areas. To continue to neglect these vital areas is to imperil our future growth as an educated society. We cannot afford to face the challenges of transition to the 21st century with "one-third of a nation" ill-educated and ill-prepared for life in a highly technical civilization. In conclusion, may I say that we in Manchester are highly enthusiastic about this bill, and we have no qualms about our college joining this state system of higher education. The proposed Commission should be able to provide the state with some long-needed direction in the area of higher education. We look forward to the growth and development which the passage of this bill would insure. We would be proud to be charter members of a growing complex of community colleges in Connecticut dedicated to providing superior educational opportunities to all who can benefit from post-secondary programs. We are not afraid to sacrifice a little autonomy in order to improve and extend public higher education in our state. We are happy to have been among the pioneers in this movement -- now we look forward to becoming old-timers in the new state system. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Mrs. Bourn.

Miss Anne Hogan: At this time, I had hoped that Dr. Orville Sweeting, who is the assistant in charge of the Master of Arts Teachers Program at Yale, would be here. He is conducting an all-day session, but he does hope to be here later. However, I have just one more statement that I got last night, over the 'phone. Sister Mary Theodore, probably one of the most beloved members of our Commission, is recuperating from an operation. She wanted desperately to be here today, but the doctor wouldn't let her. She asked me, when I spoke to her yesterday, she asked me to convey to you, her sense of urgency. She said we are literally in a mold of history here in Connecticut. It is the mold of the emergence of a new era. New sociological changes evolving rapidly. An era in which a large numbers of persons, not be educated for longer period of their lives, there is a new need for planning to meet these demands, not only for preparation for work, but for new leisure. There is a new need to keep step with national development. Plans for new

Miss Anne Hogan, cont'd: (Statement from Sister Mary Theodore)

community colleges are springing up like daffodils, and need to be coordinated to give the required education. There is a new need for planning by a new board, such as that recommended in our study. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you very much, Miss Hogan. The entire Committee is grateful for your excellent presentation, and your excellent studies, which we know is the result of two years of very hard deliberations. I would now like to call on former Governor, Wilbur Snow, who wishes to make a statement. We will then ask any legislators who are present, if they would like to speak.

Gov. Wilbur Snow: Madam chairman, members of the Committee, and friends. I have just been visiting some community colleges in New York. They all ask one question: Why has Connecticut lagged behind all the other states in junior colleges? I don't know how to answer them, except I remember what Governor Cross said. He said, "Why is Connecticut like the Gods in Homer?" The answer is, "It takes one step in a thousand years!" And yet, it took one hundred and thirty five years to ratify the Bill of Rights. In this state of Connecticut, we're slow moving. I tell you, if I could show you some of the individual items I have, you'd be interested. I have 35 girls for cleaning teeth in one of the Community colleges, and she said if it wasn't for this community college, she'd have no course in history or literature (inaudible) like cleaning teeth. Another group were technical hospital technicians. And they said the only thing that saved us from being orderlies, and nothing more, is these community colleges. That's what these things can do. Now, I think you have a fine bill here, but it's too long. I wish you would abbreviate it, because a lot of people won't have time to even read it. Some of these things you ask the Commission to do, like lay out the courses for individual towns and to evaluate the results, I don't think your committee of 12 could do that. In fact, I think you'll need two committees, one overall Committee, and one local Committee, and I think you could boil it down to that, and be more efficient than you are now. But you know better about that than I do. However, there are a few suggestions I'd like to make. One is that I would like to have the bill put in the legislature that would say that the state of Connecticut takes care of 14 grades, instead of 12 grades, as a part of our public education.

Gov. Wilbur Snow, cont'd:

639

Fourteen grades, instead of twelve grades. We're going to come to it anyway. Look what's happening here. Look at 2000 or 1500 turned down in the University of Connecticut, so many turned down in Danbury. In the Hartford Times last Saturday, they carried the whole thing. There are 42%, 40%, 30% being turned down. Those children have no place to go, and a lot of them cannot afford college fees that, that has a large fee. In New York I found they had 600 dollars: \$200. paid by the student, \$200. paid by the County, and \$200. paid by the state of New York. In other places \$200. paid for the city, \$200. paid by the state, and \$200. paid by the student. Now, a college like that could be attended. We took a summary of 50% who couldn't go to college, and we found that 70% of those 50% could benefit by extra education. Now, I would like to have, also, the Padula bill amended because a few years ago we had a lottery bill with the overhauling of all these organizations in the state, and we put in millions of dollars, I think \$20,000,000. You probably know better than I do. \$20,000,000. to look over all these institutions in the state. Now, the Padula bill is \$50,000. Why that wouldn't take care of one faculty. You put in the money in the Padula bill similar to the money in the lottery bill, some of you may remember that lottery bill to overhaul the state institutions, I think it was \$20,000,000. Am I right? If you put something in the Padula bill like that, then we could start. I've been working since 1958, trying to get a community college in Middletown, and they got no results at all, until this last fall, both mayors, Republican and Democrat, came out for junior college. They came out for it, but we have no money for it. Now they're going to get 40% for the buildings of a junior college. And that means, if the state gives 50% (inaudible) that we can take care of the other 10%. I urge that you expedite this (inaudible) that you're doing, and take care of these children, because in the Commission report, look over crimes in New York with 92% were drop-outs who committed the crimes. So we get a choice between taking care of these fellows. In New York yesterday, they were begging me for money. When I spoke to some of them. They said "I don't want to go to work" "I can't get any work". That's because of automation. It's worse than you said. Automation has dropped from 27% to 5% in the last survey on (inaudible) Not 15% but only 5%. And that means you have

Gov. Wilbur Snow, cont'd:

640

more skill than the high school can give you, or else, your're out in left field. I urge, I thank you for what you've been doing, and I urge that you expedite as fast as possible. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Governor Snow. I would now like to call on any legislators who wish to be heard.

Rep. Charles J. Marshall: I'm representative Marshall from Wilton, and after hearing this wonderful presentation, I feel like (inaudible) I'm going to tilt at this window. I'm going to oppose this bill. Not because I oppose the goal, but because I definitely oppose the road established to reach that goal. We do have a Commissioner of Education. And believe it or not, I'm not speaking about Commissioner Sander. He didn't know I was going to speak on this bill, and, in fact, I didn't know myself until about an hour and fifteen minutes ago when I read it more thoroughly. I believe there's great dangers in superimposing an educational horror that we already have existing in this state, and another Commission. If the Commissioner of Education, and the Commissioner of the Educational Authority in our state, feel that this is the right road to follow, I'd be willing to swallow my words. But I do believe, that having something on it right now that we have already existing and have existed for many years, this is the path along which we should go. I support the goal that we should do everything we can to support community colleges, and I would point out here, that I'm co-sponsor of a bill with Mrs. Rock that has appeared before this Committee. But I definitely oppose the principle enunciated in this bill. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Speaker Patterson? Do you wish to be heard?

Speaker J. Tyler Patterson: Thank you, madam chairman. I thought probably on a matter of this importance, there would be a considerable number of legislators to say something, so I was waiting my turn. I'm representative Patterson, from Old Lyme. I think, first of all, I would like to commend the members of the Commission for, what I think, is an outstanding job. I've read their report. We've had the opportunity and pleasure of talking, since this legislative session began with some of the education officials in the state. I think we want to talk more with them, and with

Speaker J. Tyler Patterson, cont'd:

641

this Committee, before we take any position on any particular bill. I do think that Connecticut is falling behind in higher education, and our efforts must be increased in the next few years. So we must do everything we can to coordinate our system, at least at the planning level. Practically, for my money, at the fiscal level. To whatever extent we can resolve our local jealousies and rivalries in this legislative session, in this legislative I hope we will do something that will last for a good many years to come. I think that many of us who have served up here over the years, and I served on this education committee a few years back, with great benefit to my own knowledge of the educational system of the state. I have not been at all pleased that from time to time there have been laxity and complications between the segments of our educational system. Competitions for appropriations, for priorities in one field or another, and that in the long run, we should do everything we can to eliminate. Other than that, madam chairman, I would not have any specific proposals or recommendations to make. We will, I speak now for the Republican Party, we will, in the remaining two months of this session, do our very best to arrive at any conclusion as to what the best answer is to this complicated situation, and a conclusion that will be fair to all the existing institutions we have, and that will provide a solid base, I hope, to the expansion of our system of higher education into the junior college field, and in other respects, where there is a great deal of evidence we are now somewhat lacking. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Representative Roberts, do you wish to speak?

Rep. Laurence Roberts: Thank you. Madam chairman, chairman LaGrotta, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee. My name is Larry Roberts, representative from the town of Barkhamsted. After the laudible presentation you had from the Commission, what can a layman say? Frankly, I would like to leave some observations from a long time legislative experience with this committee. We have, and I would like to say that I am extremely palled, of the universities, the colleges, the technical institutes, which Connecticut has developed in the last few years. I'm no stranger to these institutions, because for quite a number of years, I have been chairman of the subcommittee of the appropriations committee that

Rep. Laurence Roberts, cont'd:

642

deals with the budget of the Department of Education which operates these colleges and technical institutes. I might say, that since I was first elected to this legislature, back in 1928, I've seen a little cow college over in Storrs develop into a truly great university with numerous branches. In that same time, four two-year normal schools have developed first into four year teacher's colleges and not into a -- four excellent state colleges. We've observed the birth and development of the four technical institutes, which is the logical development from our system of technical schools, that we used to call "trade Schools". Each of these institutions are worthy of the pride of every citizen in Connecticut. I think they are in themselves, a fitting monument to the men who helped develop them. The hurry in developing rapidly over the last few years the need for more post secondary school education in Connecticut, has been developing even faster. We've reached a point where several thousand of our high school graduates each year cannot find facilities in Connecticut to pursue their education. Recognizing this need, the legislature two years ago authorized the appointment of a Commission to study and evaluate this problem. The Governor appointed to that Commission, a group of capable, knowledgeable, dedicated individuals, who studied this problem for the last two years. They obtained the help of a group of experts from Federal HEW, and with that as part of their, the base of their research, they recently released this report and recommendations which you are all familiar with. Personally, I think they did an excellent job. This bill before us is in the main, an implementation of that report. I think it's high time that Connecticut had an integrated, comprehensive system of higher education that would include a university, and its branches, our state colleges, our state institutes. Each of them fills the definite need, and their activities should compliment each other, not compete with one another. I think it's high time this Commission was organized and I congratulate the Commission on their report, and I might add that, as a member of the appropriations committee, if, or rather when, this bill is passed on to us, I certainly will do everything I can to see that it's implemented with appropriations to keep it and to put it in operation. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: That's the best offer yet! Are there other members of the general assembly who wish to be heard?

Rep. Jotham Reynolds: Madam chairman, Mr. House chairman, members of the joint Committee. MY name is Jotham Reynolds, representative from the town of Woodstock. I wish to thank my neighbor from the town of Putnam, Anne Hogan, chairman of the Study Commission, and all those who assisted her in the program. I expected to come here in opposition to this bill, but after a complete study of it, and a study of the proposals for amending it, I wish to register in favor of the program. I speak as a parent, and as an educator all my life. Especially from a parent's viewpoint, in regards to community colleges, I did not happen to have children who were in the valedictory, and salutatory branch of the graduating class in high school, and I speak as a parent who wishes and in favor of the other parents who have pupils or students, if you wish to call them that, graduating in the lower bracket, perhaps below the 50% of the graduating class, who, heretofore, have not had an equal opportunity with the learned group of getting education in the higher field. I'm all in favor of these community colleges, although I do not feel that their program should be academically the same as the technical school. I think there should be some separation in the advantages and the program offered in the technical schools and the community colleges, but I wish to register in favor of this program, and trust that the Committee will see their way to give it some favorable support. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you.

Rep. Thomas F. Dowd, Jr.: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta. My name is representative Thomas F. Dowd, jr. of Trumbull. I, too, would like to register most firmly in support of the concept promulgated in this bill. I'm speaking somewhat like representative Roberts, as the representative of the member of the appropriations committee. I'm also the father of three youngsters who will probably looking for college opportunities here in the state of Connecticut. The thing that most impresses me about the entire concept in the work of the group of this Commission, is that they've tried to face up, in my judgement, to the overall problem, and that is: how are we going to manage our higher educational facilities, how are we going to plan in the future? I'm sure each of us will find some

Rep. Thomas F. Dowd, Jr., cont'd:

644

points in the bill that are not entirely to our satisfaction. I just want to make a brief statement at this time, firmly in support of the concept so that we can plan our approach to give the youngsters coming along a much better opportunity to pursue their studies in this state. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Are there other members of the General Assembly who wish to be heard? If not, we will now move on and I will call on a group of people, eminent citizens of our state, who serve both as administrators and, or, both members of boards or committees who are concerned with our state tax supported educational institutions. I would first like to ask Mr. John Budde, who is chairman of the Board of Trustees in the University of Connecticut., to testify.

Mr. John J. Budde: Madam, Mr. chairman, members of the Education Committee. First I would like to say that in my opinion the study commission on higher education has rendered a most valuable service to the state and all who were involved in this highly important and very arduous task deserve the sincere appreciation and gratitude of all citizens of Connecticut. The report has highlighted more forcibly and to a greater extent than ever before the many pressing needs and problems in higher education. I am fully aware and appreciative of the sincere desire of all of the members of your committee to propose and recommend sound legislation to improve and strengthen the foundations for the higher educational structure which our great state must support if we are to keep faith with our children and the children of future generations. It is patently evident that the opportunities for post secondary education for the young people of this state must be greatly increased and broadened. There is obviously a pressing need for the establishment of publicly supported community or junior colleges and the development of this type of program should be encouraged. To insure the educational opportunities the young people of Connecticut need and deserve requires greatly increased financial support. In addition, the existing institutions of higher learning must be granted much greater autonomy if they are to provide the high quality of education which is expected of them. After a lengthy discussion of the contents of the report of the Study Commission on higher education the Board of Trustees of the

Mr. John J. Budde, cont'd:

645

University of Connecticut expressed its interest and support by voting at it's March 17 meeting that "It is completely in accord with proposals for strengthening of higher education within the state and feels that any proposed legislation should maintain and strengthen the responsibilities and authority of the University's Board of Trustees." Referring to this particular bill, however, I feel it does not adequately provide for the strengthening of higher education within the state nor does it maintain or strengthen the responsibility and authority of the University's Board of Trustees. Consequently the freedom and independence of our state University is not protected and without this we cannot expect to attract or keep highly qualified, dedicated and imaginative administrators and professors. I certainly do not wish to see measures adopted which would in any way jeopardize the great forward progress and ever increasing prestige which the University is experiencing under its present leadership. The administrative functions and other responsibilities which rightfully belong to a University if it is expected to continue to flourish as a creative center of learning and research must continue to be vested in the Board of Trustees and the duly designated officials of the University. Speaking specifically as regards the proposed SB 1341 and HB 4719, I do not believe this bill in it's present form provides for the preservation of the rightful authority and responsibility of the University's Board of Trustees. I wish, therefore, to register my opposition to this bill as presently constituted. I would like to say, however, that the Board of Trustees and the Staff of the University of Connecticut are most willing and anxious to cooperate with the legislature in any way possible to realistically approach and attempt to solve some of the very serious problems which confront us in the field of higher education. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Mr. Budde. Dr. Homer Babbidge, president of the University of Connecticut.

Dr. Homer Babbidge: Madam Chairman, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I am Homer Babbidge, president of the University of Connecticut. Mr. Budde has already stated the position of the Board of Trustees, and this is the position which, needless to say, I support. I'm aware, however, that

Dr. Homer Babbidge, cont'd:

646

the Committee is studying actively, possible modifications of the proposed legislation, and it may, therefor, be appropriate for me to amplify briefly my feelings about the proposals generally embodied in these bills. My principal reservations regarding the report of the Study Commission, upon which these bills are largely based, and particularly those features that deal with state wide organization, stem from the fact that while the Commission quite fairly and accurately diagnosed the ailments of Connecticut public higher education, its prescriptions for the relief of these conditions are less admirable. In essence, the prescriptions are too severe for the magnitude of the ailments. And the danger lies in the possible side effects of improper prescription and dosage. As I understand it, the Commission found these failings or shortcomings:

- 1) Insufficiently broad provision of post-secondary opportunities, especially of a vocational nature, for Connecticut high school graduates.
- 2) Insufficient state-wide planning for higher educational needs.
- 3) Insufficient sense of independence and identity among the four State Colleges.
- 4) Insufficient operating (and especially fiscal) authority vested in the University and the State Colleges
- 5) Insufficient factual information upon which to base legislative priorities among competing claims of various educational groups.

In my judgement, none of these requires, nor do they together require, a state-wide mechanism of such scope and authority as is recommended by the Study Commission or authorized by these bills. Each and all could be remedied by far less drastic measures. In my judgement, a state wide Commission on higher education could serve the state well. If its responsibilities were limited to those areas of known need, and not enlarged by the appropriation of authorities now reposing well and wisely in existing bodies. Such needed responsibilities would include:

- 1) the coordination of higher educational planning throughout the State.
- 2) Impartial assessment and evaluation of the various legislative and budgetary requests made in the name of higher education.
- 3) The arbitration of disputes or disagreements arising between or among

Dr. Homer Babbidge, cont'd:

bodies authorized to administer various phases of public higher education.

- 4) The conduct of educational, research and studies upon which educational progress can be based, and which would identify gaps in the state's provision for higher education.

These are acknowledged needs of the state. They are functions that can probably best be performed by a state-wide body. They are authorities that can properly be given to a Commission on higher education. To go beyond these authorities would, in my judgement, and as Mr. Budde has said, jeopardize the integrity and sense of identity - and loyalty - of the University of Connecticut. And this, in turn, would seriously threaten the bright prospects of distinction that we now enjoy.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Dr. Babbidge. I would now like to call on Mr. William Horowitz, who is chairman of the State Board of Education, who will introduce Dr. Sanders, and other members of the State Board who wish to speak on this bill.

Mr. William Horowitz: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta, my former colleagues, or perhaps we are still members of the Study Commission on Higher Education. My name is William Horowitz, and I have been chairman of the State Board of Education since 1959, was originally appointed to the State Board of Education by Governor Ribicoff in 1955, and I was reappointed by Governor Dempsey. As an individual and as chairman of the State Board of Education, I share the various views of the Commission on Higher Education and the sponsors of these bills that the state of Connecticut must develop coordinated plans to provide desirable educational opportunities in post-secondary education for the thousands of young people seeking such education. However, I did file a minority report expressing my view that no radical change in the governing structure of higher education is called for in Connecticut. The State Board of Education has taken a similar position. The governing boards of the various institutions, namely the University Trustees and the State Board of Education, have historically done a first class job and are now so doing, and this was evident, and brought out in the study made by the office of Education, and the study made

Mr. William Horowitz, cont'd:

by the Study Commission itself. As trustees of the state colleges, The State Board of Education has been aware of the needs in higher education and has repeatedly called to the attention of the legislature and the Governor the need for more facilities and more staff to accommodate young people. The Board is also prepared to undertake any new tasks or new directions the legislature determines and believes that it can achieve the desired results better than the proposed reorganization. The State Board has asked Dr. Sanders to make a detailed statement in this behalf. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. May I ask that you leave your statements, a copy of your statement with the Committee secretary? Thank you, Bill. /

Dr. William J. Sanders: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta and members of the Committee. I'm William J. Sanders, secretary of the State Board of Education. The essence of these two bills is the proposal that there be a strong central agency responsible for the state's interest in post secondary education and that this agency be completely new in its membership and relationships. The Board agrees that there should be such a strong central agency but holds that such agency should be the State Board of Education rather than a newly-created commission. The responsibility for providing adequate opportunity in higher education for Connecticut youth will continue to remain with the General Assembly regardless of the organizational pattern. Presently the General Assembly has designated the Board of Trustees of the University, the State Board of Education, and local boards of education as the agencies to manage public post-secondary education. The General Assembly has also given to the State Board of Education responsibility for accreditation and encouragement of private higher education. What SB 1341 and HB 4719 propose is to reduce the authority of the University Board of Trustees and eliminate the State Board of Education from the field of higher education in favor of three new boards. The theory apparently is that these new boards will create a new approach and possibly get more money, and thus speed the solution of the problems in higher education. The State Board position is that it is better to utilize the experience and knowledge of the present boards and their staffs, with the General Assembly indicating the direc-

Dr. William J. Sanders, cont'd:

tion in which it wishes these boards to move. The role of the University and its plan of operation are well established, and there is liaison between it and the State Board. In all the other areas of higher education, the State Board of Education can effectively encourage, expand and coordinate the work in higher education. The four state colleges have been under the supervision of the State Board of Education since their beginning as normal schools, their many years as teachers colleges, and their seven years as state colleges. The State Board of Education has consistently made recommendations to the General Assembly for increased staff and facilities to meet the wave of students hoping to enter, recommendations still to be met by Assembly action. On the question of more fiscal independence for the state colleges, the limited autonomy the colleges now enjoy can be readily expanded under State Board supervision if the General Assembly wishes to make such provision in the statutes. The State Board of Education in 1959 encouraged and supported the original proposal for public community junior colleges under the control of local boards of education and in 1963 advocated the extension to joint action by several boards of education. The type of organization resulting was one that permitted this kind of institution to get a start in Connecticut. Obviously, however, the time has come to provide greater state support for these programs. The State Board of Education has been aware of this and the Committee on Education now has before it a bill sponsored by the State Board of Education to give the public community colleges state aid for construction. Again, if the General Assembly decides that it is willing to put the resources of the state behind the public community junior colleges as it has behind the state colleges and the University, the State Board of Education can move rapidly to utilize present experienced staff members in developing such a system rather than waiting for a new commission to study the matter and secure sufficient staff. The proposed bills would transfer the technical institutions from the State Board of Education to a new board of community colleges and technical institutes. Such action would not serve the best interests of the state. Under federal law there can be only one State Board of Vocational Education, a role now filled by the State Board of Education. Moreover, the technical institutes are closely tied into our complete system of vo-

Dr. William J. Sanders, cont'd:

cational education, which, as several people pointed out already this morning under the State Board of Education has developed into a model for the nation. The relationship which the bill seeks by grouping community colleges and technical institutes could be bettered through the State Board of Education. The present General Assembly should spell out the financial commitment it is willing to make to public higher education. The Board of Trustees of the University and the State Board of Education can quickly implement it without the delays involved in adding new commissions to study the problems involved and to work out solutions. With added funds the State Board of Education could immediately increase its staff to handle necessary research and planning. Where advisory committees are called for, the Board could utilize its long and successful experience with state and regional advisory committees, some of whom you'll meet this morning. It is in an admirable position, because of its experience with all education, including vocational education and public libraries, to provide rapidly for the growing need for expanded post secondary public educational opportunities. In summary, the State Board of Education endorses the objectives of the bills in seeking to provide suitable opportunities in post secondary education for all interested Connecticut youth. However, the Board believes that this can be accomplished better under the existing agencies, with expanded resources and responsibilities as determined by the General Assembly. Thank you.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Commissioner, I've done a lot of thinking along the lines that you've been suggesting here, one has to think of alternatives to the possibility of this proposed bill being passed, and I still am thinking. In a plan such as you suggest--now take this example, I think maybe we can get to the point more quickly. Middlesex County obviously needs some sort of facilities. Under the plan that you are bringing forth, who would decide whether it should be a branch of the University or community college? This is the thing that I've come to each time that I've tried to think about it.

Dr. William J. Sanders: The people of Middlesex County would so decide. And if the Board had this responsibility, it could work with the people in the County as it has worked with the people in Norwalk, in Manchester, Winsted area, and already in some other areas in the state. If people

Dr. William J. Sanders, cont'd:

651

wanted the branch of the University, they should go, they could go there, if they wanted a community college, which is run with a little more local control, they could now, even now do it under the State Board.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: But the point is some higher group, it seems to me, should guide Middlesex County into what type institution is needed, and the stumbling block is that the State Board would have no control over the University branch establishment. This is the stumbling block, in my opinion.

Dr. William J. Sanders: Well, it needs no control over the University branch, because University branch is not a community college. It is a branch of the University, it is the first two years of the University, where students take the course which is prescribed by the University, and moved directly to it. But if people want something other than that, the Board would help them out. But they could make that decision themselves first.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Thank you.

Sen. Gustaf Carlson: I'm Senator Carlson, of the 34th district. Commissioner Sanders, pursuing the questions that Senator Hammer just raised, I grant you that what you said that if it was desirable in Middlesex County, and that's the County I'm from, that we have an Junior, so called community college, rather than the branch, a study has already been made for a branch of the University of Connecticut. The Committee set up by the last General Assembly, the study completed, and the report made to the Board of Trustees of the University of Connecticut. This is in their hands at the present time. In this case, it's up to the Board of Trustees of the University of Connecticut to determine whether such a branch is, should be located in Middlesex County. Now, the question that Senator Hammer raised ties in with this. There's also been some feeling that there should be a junior college, or rather a community college set up in Middlesex County, and here's a conflict. And while I'm speaking, sir, I would like to say this. This is the type of problem that the legislature committee on Education has been faced with over the years. We get, as you know, all these requests for various vocations, and vocation-

Sen. Gustaf Carlson, cont'd:

al schools, etc., within the particular area. Many bills come in, and each legislator likes to have, oh let's say a vocational school in his particular area, as you well know. Now in this area, I think the State Board of Education has done a commendable job, because they do have a plan for vocational schools, and this has been approached in the same way in the location of our technical institutes and post secondary schools. What we're faced with here is-- in legislative area is the fact that we have these conflicting questions that come to us, and you'll say, yes, Middlesex County, or whoever it is within Middlesex County, can decide to have a Community college, the legislation is already on the books. It is on the books, but who is to know where this is going to be? What the soundness of it will be? The location of it, etc? The same as the study of the branch of the University of Connecticut would provide. There is no one, there is no group that--not controls higher education--but offers coordination of higher education, and I think that what we have here is a--what we're asking for through this bill is in the area of higher education, first of all, have a coordination--coordinating group that coordinates all higher education; not to take away any of the powers, etc., but to resolve questions of the type that Senator Hammer just raised. This is, I think, the question. We're fully aware that we could have a community college in Middlesex County, but there's no coordinating group of this kind to help the people of Middlesex County to determine that this is what they need.

Dr. William J. Sanders: Well, representative Carlson, I -- Excuse me, Senator, I remember him when he was a representative, I'm sorry. Senator, may I refer to the very good figure of speech, used by the president of the University, when he said that the prescription seems to be too strong for the ailment. The community college is not a branch nor is it a technical institute. These are three different kinds of institutions. There's no reason why the people could not discuss with the University as well as with the Board. There's a staff to these Boards, what they want. Now, it's quite conceivable that there could be a branch at Middlesex, there could also be a community college. It might very well be that there should be both of these in a growing area of that sort. You see a branch has the same official requirements as the University at Storrs, and this would not meet the problem of which so many peo-

Dr. Wm. J. Sanders, cont'd:

ple have referred to today: but a community college would, without doubt. This should be done. There's liaison, there's good liaison between these two Boards. Now, liaison committee does not have authority, but the two institutions, the two Boards are in communion with each other, and so are the administrative heads of both of these institutions. We could work this out very easily, without setting up a Commission, Senator.

Rep. Kathleen Tracy: Commissioner, I have a question. As you know, one of the ailment, so to speak, that we found, was the very high tuition at the community colleges, and we have recommended state aid, for the community colleges. I personally hope it will be complete state aid, something on the set-up of the state colleges. Now, if this were to be the way we would decide to handle it, or recommend that it be handled when the General Assembly voted it so, then if the Middlesex County came in for a branch--not a branch, excuse me, for a community college, then you people would have to make a study of your own, to see if it was needed there, wouldn't you?

Dr. Wm. J. Sanders: Well, we certainly would, as we have done, as Senator Carlson has mentioned we have done, with technical institutes and technical schools, and have, I think, presented to this body rather compelling reasons why we did not put one in a certain place, and why we put up such an institution elsewhere. We would do that. But you see, should you come through with a bill, providing large support, this could be administered very much the way its administered to the public school systems. There could be regional boards established--as a matter of fact, we're working on this now, because we feel, even though we have not the authority to go ahead and do the work of the Commission, that the Commission, if it were started, would have some information. We have several plans, which we're working on how to establish--get regional boards to work together. We've had long experience with the administration of state aid, and it's worked out very well. We have state aid, and local control. This is not new to us.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Commissioner, would you say that your basic problems could be related to the fact that you had less money then the lack of administrative set-up?

Comm. Wm. J. Sanders: Well, yes it is. The problem has been a matter of money. We are undertaking these new responsibilities. If the board had the money, we would not need a great addition to the staff, by any means. A relatively small addition to the staff could take care of this.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Dr. Sanders, at the moment, what provision is made for the students for this fall, which neither you, in your four state colleges can take, nor the University can take? This is the area where the Commission debated loud and long. Who's going to take care of those?

Comm. Wm. J. Sanders: This is right. This is the problem. I'll tell you about some things that we're doing. We're taking some high school graduates into three of our vocational technical schools this summer: at New Haven, at Waterbury, at Torrington, in order to prepare these people for jobs that exist. We're doing this in relationship, by the way, with the Connecticut Industrial Council. This is Connecticut Industry, who's taken an interest in this, who found jobs for these people. We'll find the boys, and then we'll prepare them, and get them in to these positions. This is a small matter, I admit, but we're working this way, as far as vocational education is concerned. Now, we did have a good deal to do with the two community colleges which have been established. As a matter of fact, the Board, at its March meeting, authorized a license in the Winsted area. This is a sort of a private one, which hopes to become publicly supported. There's no reason why it cannot become supported. If they can get up enough money to start, because there's no other money, probably in another two years, unless this body, now in the Session, provides money. They'd have to wait two years, if you do it now, this would take care of people in Winsted. We could take care of these people, but it takes time, as you know, to get the money. It's not the administrative problem, as the Senator points out, that it's made out to be in this bill, and in this report. There's something else, that I forgot. In answer to Mr. LaGrotta's question. The Board did vot a basic study program, not a very good word, but this is a two year program, in the four state colleges, and the Governor has made provision in his budget for this. This is

Comm. Wm. J. Sanders, cont'd:

to utilize these four colleges in the afternoon and evening for students who are qualified to enter, but who were not able to get there because of space. They're not quite as highly qualified as the people who come in the day program, but this will give us a full utilization. We will take care of --(aside to some one in the audience) do you recall how many people-- 1400 additional students. I'm sorry to have missed that. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Commissioner, have you completed your statement?

Comm. Wm. J. Sanders: I've finished my statement. I'll leave a copy here, Senator, thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I wonder whether we might interrupt the State Board's presentation, and call on Dr. Sweeting who was delayed? He is a member of the Study Committee on Higher Education. Are you ready to go on?

Mr. Orville J. Sweeting: Madam Chairman, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being late, but we have approximately 250 students at Yale, who are here for a science-manager's symposium, and I had to get that started, but I would like to present this statement: Ladies and gentlemen of the joint committee on education: My name is Orville J. Sweeting and I reside at 108 Everit Street in the city of New Haven. As a member of the Commission on Higher Education, I have tried to represent the public interest insofar as I was able, since the Governor appointed me as one of the four public members. I have been for several years vice president of the Board of Education of New Haven, and during most of the time on the Commission I was an Associate Director of Research of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation, which has a large proportion of its research laboratories in New Haven. I am now employed by Yale University and have a major responsibility for the training of teachers for the public schools. I urge that this Committee support and that the General Assembly enact into law at this session the essential recommendations of the Commission for Higher Education, embodied in HB 4719 and SB 1341. I wish to mention particularly this morning the provisions for a comprehensively planned system of four and two-year collegiate institutions under state auspices and financed by the state. It is terribly important that a continuing com-

Mr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

656

prehensive study be made of the role of the two- and four-year colleges. These are in a crucial state of evolution and will certainly grow in number, size, and scope. All of the needs of all of the people must be taken into account, since State tax monies are already being spent in huge chunks, and will be spent in even larger chunks in future. As massive quantities of data were presented to the Commission over a period of about 15 months (much of it presenting a picture of excellent planning in certain narrowly circumscribed areas, I might add), we became convinced that these colleges need a special board (or boards) in tune to their needs and capabilities for service and that their separate programs absolutely must be coordinated for maximum effect. Some commission must have concern, in addition, for the welfare of the body politic, and for those less articulate bands of citizens who are of great importance for the continuing health and growth of our state, but who may have now no powerful champion. The power of the state will suffer if any of our citizens fail to secure the full measure of education from which they can profit. The metamorphosis of the former state teachers colleges of Connecticut over the past ten years into our only four-year public colleges is a powerful object lesson for us all. The Commission has been mindful that the University and the four-year colleges will be called upon to train most of the teachers in Connecticut schools in the ensuing years. It is therefore absolutely mandatory that the kind of education that these future teachers receive be looked at with the same critical eye that will be cast upon collegiate education for the law, for medicine, for science, and for other of life's endeavors. Too long have colleges for teachers been set apart from other collegiate institutions. The future teachers of the state's children need a broad basic education in the humanities (arts and sciences both) every bit as much as does the student who is studying to follow the law as a profession (many would argue that future teachers need it more). The simple point that I am trying to make is that the four-year colleges must be allowed to grow in scope within a broad framework of higher education, not in a competitive wasteful milieu of argument based on their history in the immediate past. There is no time to lose. Connecticut must move fast to provide a comprehensive program of education for those who can seriously profit from education beyond the twelfth grade

Mr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

657

of high school. Whether students go on should not be determined by ability to pay. On the other hand, we on this Commission are no more anxious than are you ladies and gentlemen to load a ten-thousand dollar education on a ten cent mind. From this conviction arise the commandment for excellence and the requirement for scrutiny of all programs. We have been terribly impressed, however, by the facts as they came to light during our investigation. The loss in trained intellects is staggering, a loss that Connecticut cannot longer afford to endure. Thousands of students every year leave Connecticut, many of them never to return, because they cannot gain admission to an institution of higher education in this state that fits their needs and their pocketbooks. It is readily conceded that in any circumstances many Connecticut youth would go to colleges outside the state to complete their formal education. But if Connecticut's system of higher education were of first-rate quality and quantity today, and opportunities were available to meet the needs, several thousand intelligent high school graduates would find their ties to this state strengthened rather than severed, in many instances forever. The bills before you are the result of a very comprehensive study of the problem of higher education in Connecticut from all points of view, focussed on the felt-need to today, and the likelihood of greater need tomorrow. As the world becomes more complex, the need for educated people will increase -- and I mean educated in the broadest sense, men and women who are trained to think for themselves, and not alone highly skilled in a narrow technology for a specific trade, however important that may be. The Research Department of the company for whom I worked for almost 15 years recruits on a worldwide scale for certain positions, but in a very real sense the well being of the company depends on technicians, secretaries, all kinds of business men and women gathered from the local community. The future of Connecticut is going to be determined by the quality of the education of its people, for this is what the managers of business look for when they seek new plant, research, and office locations. Any company can train its employees in special skills - but if, and only if, the recruits have been broadly educated up to the limit of their capacity. It is of the utmost importance that our four-year and two-year colleges present a comprehensive pattern wherein any competent student in Connecticut [not merely the

Mr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

658

the top 10-15 percent) can find instruction in any subject, at a cost which he can pay. The state cannot afford to provide otherwise, lest the future be mortgaged beyond redemption. Already the time is late - many states are ahead of us - and Connecticut must catch up as quickly as possible with the twentieth century by a massive infusion of intelligent people and intelligent and forward-looking programs. It is time to look forward and not back, to make plans rather than explain why plans were not made, and to use the available funds to better advantage rather than to excuse inaction by blaming lack of money. You can be deadly sure that there will never be enough money to do everything that the mind of man is capable of conceiving. Some group must be charged with comprehensive planning and especially important, with the establishment of priorities with only one guiding principle: What is best for the state (economically, socially, culturally) in the time span of the next fifty years? Some groups concerned with higher education in this state today seem to believe that they would lose all if a permanent commission on higher education were to be created, whose principal function would be planning programs for the long haul, and funding them after priorities are established. Though it is certain that in some specific instances autonomy will be lost -- it has always been so since the founding of the Republic -- these groups would in the future be perhaps capable of exerting a much greater influence for the common good than they exert now. For if their cause is just and will bear scrutiny in relation to all programs, the whole state will benefit. Excellent programs will have an opportunity to flourish. Only yesterday the newspapers carried news of a report of the Council of State Governments, which predicts a deficit of \$18 million in the financing of public higher education in Connecticut by 1970, unless steps are taken now. It is terribly important that the General Assembly take measure now to see that every tax dollar spent on higher education is wisely spent in the best possible type of education, without unneeded duplication and without waste of time. I must emphasize here something that is often lost sight of in reporting such as I just mentioned. Money is not necessarily the solution of all problems in higher education. There is no doubt that in Connecticut more money is going to be needed (and therefore the wise spending of the available funds is of paramount importance), but money

Mr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

659

alone is not going to insure the doing of the job that needs to be done. It is time to abandon the piecemeal approach of the past, which may have been adequate for the need in other times. We must plan comprehensively for the wisest possible benefit for the greatest possible number of students. Only after the widest possible public discussion of all points of view should such an expensive step be taken as the establishment of a new collegiate institution. To some, money in larger amount is the answer to every problem. As I have implied already, more money for higher education in Connecticut might in the long run be an evil, if the expansion of the establishment were not preceded by intelligent planning, involving an expression of the opinions and needs of many groups. Problems are solved by people, not by money alone, but by the right people of intelligence, vision, and experience coming together for a common purpose of high resolve at the right time in history. Money we must have to win the battle to educate Connecticut's children beyond the high school, but only after the right people have been found to do the right things at the right time. I urge that the General Assembly create the commission provided for in these bills without limitations on place of residence (for intelligence and concern recognize no town limits) or on what factions are supposed to be represented (for they are ephemeral). The only requirement for the members of the Commission should be that they can see a problem whole, and that they should be fearless intellectually, intimidated by nothing but their conscience before Almighty God to do what is just and best for the State, which is to say, for all the people. Thank you, very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you.

Rep. Philip Doran: Madam chairman. Is it permitted some questions?

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Yes, certainly.

Rep. Philip Doran: Representative Doran, from Berlin.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Dr. Sweeting, there's a question.

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: Sorry, I didn't hear the question.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: There's a question coming from a member of the Committee.

Rep. Philip Doran: Mr. Sweeting. In your beginning of your treatise, on the first page, you suggested it is terribly important that a continually comprehensive study be made of the whole of the two and four year colleges. I'm slightly confused -- do you want to have this matter that's set forth by this bill continue on to study, or as you said on the end of your presentation, do you want this bill adopted?

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: Senator Falsey, I feel that --

Rep. Philip Doran: Thank you, but --

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: I'm sorry. My feeling is that the study which I'm referring to here should be part of the charge given to the Commission, if one is set up to study the needs and the programs and the financing of higher education in the future. I think that the time for study is past, we've spent 15 months intensively on it. The State Education Department has spent many years, other groups have studied, and I think it is time to bring the matter into one particular body's hands, which is charged with the responsibility. And I think that this Commission which is proposed in the bill, would be able to cope with the situation. My feeling is that they would be required to set up a continuing study to evaluate the programs and make sure that they are accomplishing what the legislature desires.

Rep. Philip Doran: Mr. Sweeting. This package here, that you've presented, is wrapped up in some very nice sounding words that we all agree with I'm sure. In other words, words in favor of higher education. But the point of which, as I understood it, was to determine the road to follow in connection with higher education. Now, in one place in your treatise you say, it is time to abandon the piecemeal approach of the past. Should I understand, or whoever is listening here, that this is a criticism of the present State Board of Education?

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: I didn't intend it to be a criticism of anyone. I intended my remarks to be a criticism of the attacks upon the problems, from a location point of view, from an immediate problem that arises, rather than a long look. I know that a planning group has been at work on this for some years, I'm not unmindful of this. But I think that the response in the setting up of branches of the University, two-year colleges and four-year colleges has been in response to a rather piecemeal operation. Certain groups have

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

661

been able to satisfy their needs, and its perfectly proper that this group should be concerned with its own local needs, but I think in our discussions over the past year, there has been a lack of total overall planning which is desirable from the standpoint of the entire state.

Rep. Philip Doran: Mr. Sweeting. If the guiding principle of the Board of Education, as, I believe, the Commissioner earlier described, was to assist the temper and the feelings of the people in the different areas involved, where these needs have been expressed, if that was his procedure, and I believe it was, is this procedure something you'll object to, or would you have it done otherwise by arbitrary court method of some kind?

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: I think the procedure which the Commissioner apparently outlined before I came in, in which the feelings of the, and the desires of the various groups around the state is assessed, is the proper way to go at the problem. I think my only difference would be, with Commissioner Sanders, is that the attack has not been comprehensive enough, and broad enough, to encompass all of the needs. This is the impression you get from listening to the facts, as they were presented to us.

Rep. Philip Doran: And lastly, Mr. Sweeting. What special magic is there, in your mind, which, I don't believe, is brought out here? In another organization, separate and distinct from the State Board of Education, which now has education as its basic, what special magic is there in another body taking care of a part of this problem? Since, I believe you said earlier, they're all inter-related.

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting: I think that my personal feeling-- and now I'm speaking only for my personal feeling, is that, one body, as Mr. Tooker proposed, should encompass all of the planning for all education, from kindergarten to the graduate school. I think this would be the ideal, if it could be encompassed. Yet there is a large enough job to be done here at elementary and secondary education, on the one hand, and in higher education on the other hand, and the feeling has been quite clear that one has been emphasized and the other has not been emphasized sufficiently. I think there's no magic, as I tried to indicate here, there's no magic. Every-

Dr. Orville J. Sweeting, cont'd:

662
thing comes about by people doing things in response to needs within the capabilities of them, and withing the capabilities of the funds available. Did I answer it all?

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you very much, Dr. Sweeting. May we go back to the State Board? Mrs. Minnie MacDonald?

Mrs. Minnie MacDonald: Honorable chairman and members of the Committee. I am Mrs. Minnie Macdonald, a member of the State Board of Education since my initial appointment by Governor Lodge in 1952, and re-appointment by Governor Ribicoff in 1958. Just listening this morning to what has preceded me, I had to rouse myself once or twice, and say: Well, now this is not us speaking! this is not the State Board of Education that I'm listening to. But the sentiment and points made me believe that we were actually too the other agents asking you for increased support for higher education and for education all along the line. It was that realistic, because we have so often done that in the past. Before I go any further, I would like to congratulate the Committee, and thank them very sincerely, the Commission, headed by Miss Anne Hogan, who, of course is a member of our town of Putnam, from which I come, for their work. I think that they have succeeded in coinciding their decisions over all with exactly the decisions that we have had, the problems we have had over all the years that I have served on the State Board of Education. I don't want to be too lengthy in what I have to say. I do want to say that in supporting the position taken by my colleagues, I would like to point out that the record demonstrates the concern which the State Board of Education has had for sufficient educational opportunities for all Connecticut children and youth. This program has progressed over a period of many years, aided by the legislature and the money secured spent, I think, wisely and well attested by one of the previous speakers, who said: that these programs pointed out the progress that had been made by the State Board of Education in a few years. We all know that it takes money. There's nothing magic about education. There's no magician work for that. We have to have money for whatever we do that is an improvement. The Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner have been sensitive to the needs in the state colleges as these have been presented to them by the state college president and the Department of higher education, and the Board has been well

Mrs. Minnie MacDonald, cont'd:

663

informed of the needs of these colleges. Both the Norwalk and Manchester Boards of Education have been encouraged and assisted in their work of developing new public community colleges. In cooperation with the Connecticut Council on higher education, the State Board of Education has maintained close liaison with the private colleges and has maintained high standards of accreditation. Through the Board's support and the competence of its staff, four of the finest technical institutes in the nation have been developed. This record makes it reasonable to expect that if the General Assembly decides on an expanded and accelerated program of support for higher education the experience of the State Board of Education will be more effective for quick action than would a number of new agencies. I ask the Committee to weigh this point seriously in considering the proposed bills. We can take off our hats, all of us, in Connecticut, to the standards that we hear praised continuously with our meeting with other State Boards. All of the State Boards of the northeast have a program of meeting together and discussing problems of mutual concern, and this is one we feel that has reached a point of particular perfection. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. Mr. George Pratt?

Mr. George D. Pratt: Madam chairman, Mr. chairman. I am George D. Pratt, and I was appointed to the State Board of Education by Governor Ribicoff in 1958, and reappointed by Governor Dempsey. I'm sure, from our discussions with the Board, that all of them that I have talked with are enthusiastic about the recommendations for general expansion and progress in higher education contained in the report of the Commission. At least I feel that they weigh very strongly. The implementation of these recommendations is what really matters in spite of any disagreement over proposed changes in structure. I suggest that the Committee should be wary of reliance upon the assumption that new machinery and new people will necessarily produce the results the Commission of Higher Education is seeking. If the legislature is really interested in increasing the resources in higher education in Connecticut it should indicate its wishes and call upon the existing boards to work toward these goals. The State Board of Education for example, along with its staff has been part-

Mr. George D. Pratt, cont'd:

664

icularly successful in helping local and regional agencies and other groups to work together to develop local and regional educational activities. In the case of community colleges such continued effort could be especially effective. Along with the other members of the Board, I must support the position that the Board's experience and knowledge should be retained in the field of higher education. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. Miss Margaret Kiely, did you wish to speak?

Miss Margaret Kiely: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee. I am Margaret Kiely of Bridgeport, member of the State Board of Education originally appointed by Gov. Bowles, and later by Governor Ribicoff and Governor Dempsey. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you. I speak to you against a long and comprehensive background of in professional education, principally in college administration at the top level. My deepest concern with the outcomings of this legislation, is wholly with its potential, with its possible influence on and contribution to the best interests of Connecticut's program in education, in higher education at the moment. Before I go on, I want to express my sincere appreciation of the work of the committee. Its forceful presentation of the immediate need of large expanded opportunities and facilities in higher education and for a concerted approach for providing those provisions, I applaud most gratefully and most enthusiastically. I regret that I must say that I think the report itself does not offer the most feasible, the most promising or most economical solution to the problem. I support the position outlined by the Commission of Education. The proposal to discard the services of the State Board of Education on higher education is, I believe unwise, wasteful, unrealistic, unjustified in the light of experience. The capacity and ability of the State Board to conduct, expand, coordinate higher education is a matter of record. For 19 years, since 1946, the state colleges have increased enrollment from 923 to 7,032 full time day students. This growth could have been greatly augmented had the recommendations of the State Board been enacted into legislation. For every session of the legislature since 1946, the Board has proposed building programs, calculated stat-

Miss Margaret Kiely, cont'd:

665

istically, scientifically, in full accord with the sociological, economic, geographical principles relevant to the question. Every year, or every close of the legislative session has found active construction well below the recommendations. Demonstrably the Board has anticipated, and proved to deal with the passive signs here of expanding, and coordinating our higher education. It has long been aware of, actively alert to the very problems noted by the Commission, including, I may say, the need of more community colleges, in which area the State Board has already made a beginning--and for the needs of the lowest 50% so long generally unrecognized. The growing young people of our State, who must have post high school offerings, post high school experience. The Board is now ready, well prepared to maintain this record of achievement, carry on its efforts, and its successful efforts in the coordination and expansion of higher education. It needs, of course, strengthened resources that are certainly envisioned for the work of any commission that may come in to take over the whole group. It is ready to prove, to carry on, its proved ability to cope with emerging problems. It has been alert to them as they have come on, and we are in (inaudible) of emerging programs. With all the conscience I can bring to this discussion, I give you my well considered professional and civic judgement that the needs of education in the state, especially of your young people will be best served by your leaving in the hands of the State Board, strengthened materially, strengthened financially, and guided--leave the responsibility in the hands of the State Board for what we all recognize as an immediately needed expansion and coordination of higher education in the State. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. Mr. Eugene Goundrey?

Mr. G. Eugene Goundrey: Madam chairman, members of the Committee. I am one of the newer members of the State Board of Education, having been appointed initially by Governor Ribicoff in 1960, and reappointed by Governor Dempsey. I share with my colleagues on the State Board of Education the views expressed by Dr. Sanders. I agree that there should be a strong central agency responsible for the State's interest in post-secondary education. However, one particular point which concerns me is the assumption that a reorganization and new boards

Mr. G. Eugene Goundrey, cont'd:

666

will produce the answers to the problems in higher education, chief amont which is adequate financing for what we need. I have no reason for believing that organizational changes alone will bring increased funds. If increased funds were made available for planning, staffing and construction, the State Board of Education could quickly institute the steps needed to move forward in higher education. Moreover, neither the report of the Commission nor the contents of the bill suggest how the problem of financing the required expansion of higher education is to be met. Reorganization by itself will not eliminate the problem the State Board of Education has faced in the past; i.e., political and budgetary considerations holding back the plans for expanded services in higher education. If the people, through their duly elected representatives in the legislature, have the will to provide the financial resources, the State Board of Education is in a better position to provide the leadership in higher education than would be any newly created agency. Consequently, I support the views expressed by Dr. Sanders on behalf of The State Board of Education. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. I would now like to call on the presidents of the state colleges, and since we never know quite how to do it, we will do it alphabetically, and we will start with Central Connecticut. Is Dr. Welte here?

Mr. Herbert D. Welte: Madam chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee. The state college presidents have prepared a statement of position in regard to the legislation which is now before you. They have asked me to leave the statement with the members of the Committee. It is, in effect, a statement of guiding principles, which should be considered in the developement of higher education, in our state. I would like to supplement what appears in this document, by a few observations of my own, if I may.

- 1) The state college presidents wish to commend the study commission for calling attention, more effectively than ever before, to the needs for higher education in Connecticut and for suggesting a structure which, with proper modifications, would best serve the youth of the state.
- 2) They believe that an agency which would be primarily responsible for planning and research, and which would present a budget would most likely be advantageous.

Dr. Herbert D. Welte, cont'd:

667

- 3) They further believe that the responsibility for developing educational policy should be vested in a Board for the state colleges, whether or not this is the State Board of Education, and that the responsibility for administering the respective constituents units should be vested in the President. In this regard, it is essential for the state colleges to have (as much) autonomy (as is consistent with state policy).
- 4) It is desirable that opportunities be provided for frequent exchange of ideas between the presidents, the members of the Governing Board and the members of the coordinating agency.
- 5) Finally, the presidents recognize that the General Assembly and the Governor have the authority to determine what portion of the state's economic resources should be committed to the support of higher education. But they also believe that once such determination has been made and the appropriations have been apportioned to each college on the basis of the requests, the responsibility for the expenditure of such funds should be vested in the appropriate administrative officials of the college. The other state college presidents are here, Madam chairman, and are prepared to supplement what I have presented at this time. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: In keeping with our alphabetical tradition, may we now hear Dr. Ruth Haas?

Dr. Ruth A. Haas: Senator chairman, representative LaGrotta, ladies and gentlemen. I, too, want to commend the Study Commission, because I think that they have focused attention on higher education, which has been very badly needed. I also would like to say that this committee should be congratulated, because over the years I have seen this committee function over the years. They have been very well aware of the needs of the colleges, and I think that they have been alerted to the fact that we have planned our program, and this committee has supported us, most admirably. And for that, I know we are most grateful. In the best interests of the state, I -- our plans have not always been possible to carry out financially. Hence, this report, giving

Dr. Ruth A. Haas, cont'd:

668

strength to the need for additional financial aid, and also to the need of a local autonomy is, in my opinion, a very great step forward. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. Dr. Hilton C. Buley?

Dr. Hilton C. Buley: Madam chairman, Mr. chairman, the Committee. I'm Hilton Buley, from Southern Connecticut State College. The members of the Commission making this study, but also the members of the General Assembly I too want to commend. The members of the General Assembly who initiated the Commission in the first place, and who have, and are, showing a great deal of interest in trying to find solutions to the real knotty problems of providing very worthy higher education to every worthy and able young man and woman in the state Connecticut. I commend them also; for the work and the diligence and the effort they have been striving to give the colleges and the universities over the many years. I wish to go on record as favoring the spirit and the goals, as set forth by the Commission, and also by the Education Committee, especially in creating a statewide plan for improving and expanding opportunities for higher education, and also for increasing the amount of financial support for a greatly expanding college age population, and thirdly, I wish to thank, and to commend them, for their efforts in creating greater ^{autonomy} economy for the universities and the state colleges, by which they can better fulfill their obligations and functions to the people of the state of Connecticut. And to support this position, I would like to read a statement published by the American Council on Education, which as you can well imagine, this problem is not found only in Connecticut, but throughout the United States. This matter of the erosion of the autonomy of institutions of higher education, by various state government agencies. And as a result, in 1960, they presented a position paper as a means of leadership and guidance to state legislators throughout the United States. It was drawn and drafted by Dr. (Inaudible), consultant on higher education of the southern region of higher education. "The vitality of American colleges and universities in fulfilling their role in the life and welfare of the Nation has been derived largely from the autonomy and (inaudible). Amen."

Dr. Hilton C. Buley, cont'd:

669

Among those that are tax supported, some are assured that autonomy by constitutional provision, others by legislation, and some are (inaudible) -- Freedom from (inaudible) control has enabled these institutions to respond to the changing social needs, to prepare leaders, and cultured citizens, and through research to extend the boundaries of knowledge and improve the welfare of mankind. To achieve these goals, institutional policies have been made by distinguished laymen, and the responsibility for management has been delegated to professional educators. The continuing excellence of the state colleges and universities will depend upon the preservation of their autonomy. Today, however, there is great concern over the persistent erosion of this autonomy. Concern that it amply justified by the challenging reports of most overt campus and the state government and higher education, efficiency and freedom.. Ladies and gentlemen, the college presidents, and after very careful deliberation, prepared a statement of principles has just been presented to you by Dr. Walte, the chairman of our group, and I wish to say that I am completely in accord with this report. Thank you very much for this opportunity to express myself.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Dr. Buley. Dr. J. Eugene Smith, president of Willimantic State College.

Dr. J. Eugene Smith: Madam Chairman, members of the joint Committee on Education. I wish to add my personal statement to the statements of Mr. Horowitz, other members of the State Board of Education, and the other State College presidents. In the first place, I wish to pay tribute to the State Board of Education for all its past efforts in behalf of the state colleges. I wish also to be recorded as approving the objectives of the Study Commission on higher education and working to create the conditions to foster the orderly and adequate growth needed, in the Connecticut institutions on higher education, in the years ahead. The need is urgent for increasing sharply the flow of funds into Connecticut's public higher education institutions--no matter what the system of control. The need is equally urgent for establishing the conditions of greater freedom and autonomy within the State's administrative structure so that the institutions can respond creatively to the responsibilities they have--not only by growth in enrollments, faculty and physical plant, but by developing the variety

Dr. J. Eugene Smith, cont'd:

670

and quality of programs that can best serve the needs in a changing society and changing state. I would like to stress this need for greater autonomy for the public higher education institutions--autonomy in the management of their own affairs and freedom from hampering restrictions that have grown up within the state administrative machinery over the years. I see, too, the need for some more effective overall planning and coordination to support the adequate development of public higher education in the State. This must be based upon continuous research of a kind and amount that we do not now have. I would further like to see a unified or coordinated budget for public higher education submitted biennially to the General Assembly. Whether our own governing board remain the State Board of Education or be a separate Board for the State Colleges, I would like the board that operates the State Colleges to be something like this: to have the thorough support from the General Assembly that would enable it to be something like this:

- 1) A strong policy-making board free of hampering restrictions from other agencies.
- 2) A board focussing strongly on the needs and problems of the State Colleges with decisions supported by continuous research in the higher education area.
- 3) A board to which the presidents of the colleges have access, direct and periodic, to discuss problems and policies and to discuss budgets in relation to educational needs and programs.
- 4) A board whose decisions and policies and budgets for the colleges would be adopted within some general, overall, coordinated planning for the growth of all higher education in the State.

Finally, if we were, perchance, to have a commission for higher education to develop overall planning and some degree of coordination, great care, I think, must be taken to prevent the commission from developing a large central bureaucracy. And great care must be exercised to locate the maximum authority, responsibility and autonomy in the boards that are working directly with the presidents of the institutions. Otherwise, the hopes of meeting Connecticut's needs creatively in the field of higher education will be hampered and frustrated in the years to come. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Dr. Smith. Now, in keeping with our procedure, the next group we will hear will be the Citizens Consulting Committee, for the technical institutes. We will then hear Mr. John Driscoll, president of the Connecticut State Labor Council, and Miss Ella Rice of the Department of Higher Education of the CEA. We will hope, with your cooperation, to do all of this by one o'clock. We will then adjourn for lunch, and resume the hearing at two. I would now ask that Mr. Paul Mali, who is chairman of the committee for the technical institutes to speak.

Mr. Paul Mali: Thank you, madam chairman, and members of the Senate and House Committee on Education. My name is Paul Mali, a director at the General Dynamics Electric Boat Corporation, and chairman of a committee of industrialists who would like to be heard on SB 1341, and HB 4719. Naturally, these bills are of great concern to us in industry. We certainly are in favor of higher education, and more opportunity for Connecticut students. But we are not in favor of the reorganization which is proposed in these bills. It is difficult for us in industry to understand why we are going to change our concept of technical institute administration when we have been a model for other states. The need for engineering technicians in our industry is still high and will remain high provided the usefulness and orientation of the technical institute programs are not injected with academic or non-vocational influences. To place the technical institute administration within an academically controlled pattern of higher education is to broaden the gap between industry and the educational institutions that supply it with its needed manpower. The need for technicians, of course, has been emphasized repeatedly in many, many studies, and I'm not going to quote any statistics, for the sake of brevity here. But what I am going to point out is, we cannot allow a change in technical institute administration in the middle of the stream, where we, in industry, are crying for engineering technicians. To allow the technical institute administration to take an academic posture is to create another barrier for us in industry. To approve of the above bill, as it is, is a mistake. The Committee on Education can not, must not, ignore what our needs are, and to do so, would be to create another block. I would like to ask a key question to the members of the Committee, and I believe it's really the issue. Is our problem one of reorganization, or any combination or permutation of our existing organization? Or is our problem money?

Mr. Paul Mali, cont'd:

672

I'd like to site just one example. We, at General Dynamics, requested from the State Board of Education, through the division of vocational education, about three years ago, for a nuclear engineering curriculum in the state. No such a curriculum exists. We asked them three years ago, and we were amazed at the efficiency and the dispatch that they put together a curriculum, made the proposal for an addition, and were ready to go. We asked them when can we get graduates, and we went on record at our firm that we would hire, if not all of them, most of the graduates. They indicated it must, of course, go to legislature for the funding, and all of the other necessary policies. Well, I point out to you, that we're still waiting, after three years for that nuclear curriculum. The problem is not getting these needs identified and crystalized, but the problem is the money to supplant and implement what we have already expressed. So what we really need is a loosening of the funds to accelerate our existing programs, as they now exist. Now there are other industrialists throughout the state that are also concerned with this bill. I would like to introduce a few of them to you and I'm sure they will keep their remarks as brief as possible, in response to the madam chairman's request.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: I'm Senator Lucy Hammer of the 12th district. Is your only strong objection to this proposed plan in the area of technical education?

Mr. Paul Mali: Primarily, but there's also the vocational schools, which we feel the State Board of Education has done a remarkable job for us. But I'm not sure whether that would be changed in any way.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: The vocational schools on the secondary level do not enter into this conversation?

Mr. Paul Mali: Yes. Our principle concern is the technical institute which must be flavored with vocational intent for industry. I'd like to introduce another industrialist who is concerned with this. Dr. Swanson, who is the manager at the American Cyanamid Company in Wallingford, Connecticut

Dr. D. L. Swanson: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta, and members of the Committee. First of all, I'M at the Stamford Research Laboratories of the American Cyanamid Company. I reside in Greenwich.

Dr. D. L. Swanson, cont'd:

673

I'd like to say just a bit about Cyanamid's Stamford Research Laboratories since it is an employer of over a thousand, and one of the largest installations in this state devoted entirely to research. In addition, Cyanamid operates plants with laboratory facilities in Wallingford and Danbury. I would like, therefor, to speak of the role of the technician in a research laboratory, since this is the area which I am personally involved. In the chemical research laboratory we are experiencing an ever increasing need for technicians, related directly to the shortage of scientists with baccalaureate degrees. These individuals have received training oriented toward graduate study rather than toward laboratory experience, and the best follow the route to advanced degrees. The highly trained scientist with a Ph. D. should plan, organize, and interpret, while other members of the research team should do most of the experiments. This role is, and must be filled to a greater extent by technicians, rather than by graduates. Connecticut industry has been fortunate to be able to recruit these technicians locally. Under the present educational system in Connecticut its industries have a strong say in fitting the curricula to local needs. The technical institutes that train these technicians are model institutes known nationally for their excellence. Therefor, I am genuinely concerned that the changes recommended in the proposed bill may weaken the technical institutes and lessen their relationship with industry. I'd like to say, that in any case that if we are to do something, the first idea of increasing funds to the present system be considered. And in any case, that the bill be given rather extensive study, more than the month or so that we have seen it, before passage, and not be brought before the present session of the legislature.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Dr. Swanson.

Mr. Paul Mali: I would like now to ask Mr. Deevey, of the Perkin-Elmer Corporation in Norwalk, who is the director of industrial relations to indicate his concern over the bill.

Mr. Robert Deevey: Madam chairman, and members of the Committee. I won't bore you with a presentation. Let me just ask you, rather answer Dr. Swanson's comments, that we can't speak highly enough of the product that is turned out educationally from the vocational schools, and the technical institutes in the state. We're a little confused as to the research, in our research on the question, the professional educators that we talked to seem opposed to the bill. The ones I indicated were business people, and so in that sense we're not able, I guess, to evaluate what their objections are. Let me just record that my Company's standpoint, we would urge against any legislation that would jigger at all with the confidence (competence) of the technical institutes and of the vocational education program in this great state of ours. Thank you very much.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Might I say to you, that in view of the fact that this is a 17 page bill, we have a few areas, since this bill was published, that some of us on the Committee, that are working on the bill, have been considering. I can't speak for the whole Committee, but this is one area that is under discussion, and we are fluid on this point.

Mr. Robert Deevey: I get you, thank you.

Mr. Paul Mali: Another industrialist who would like to be heard at this time is Mr. Tallalay, of the B. F. Goodrich Company in Shelton, general manager.

Mr. Anselm Tallalay: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta, ladies and gentlemen. I am Anselm Tallalay, general manager of the B. F. Goodrich Company in Shelton, and also a member of the State Advisory Committee for Trade and Technical Education. The Committee that I represent, passed unanimously, a resolution in a meeting of April 7th, that the advisory committee for trade and technical education is strongly in favor of the retaining of the technical institutes in the division of the vocational education under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education under present regulations. I have a copy of the resolution here, which I would like to leave with the chairman. "I am personally convinced that this is not a self serving resolution. Many excellent arguments against the inclusion of the

Mr. Anselm Tallalay, cont'd:

675

technical institutes under the Commissioner of higher education as currently proposed, have been already presented, and it is difficult, under the circumstances, to be neither (inaudible) nor redundant. The need for well trained technicians in science and industry is very great. The technician is an ever important part of industry, as is the scientist. The technical institutes have performed well under their present jurisdiction, and have established for themselves an enviable national reputation. In addition, the evening course high school extension programs of the technical institutes which utilize the facilities of the regional vocational technical high schools are serving occupational educational extension needs of some five to seven thousand adults at this point. This enviable national reputation of the technical institutes is not accident. Through local advisory bodies and close contact with industry, and other groups of citizens, the technical institutes have gained a thorough understanding of industry's needs. With single-mindedness of purpose, they have gathered competent technical staff, and have set up standards of training resulting in competent broad education, producing graduates of high caliber. Also the technical institutes have been able to move with inestimable speed within the available funds in adopting new advisably needed curricular, and program. The flowering of this type of education needs specific administrative and inter---- climate. The present jurisdiction is able to provide such a climate. A predominantly academically oriented proposed commission may not be able to do so with equal effectiveness. In fact, it takes a little courage, in this day and age, to see the contribution of the technicians and of the scientists in the proper perspective light. And yet, it has been said that any society which automatically puts the philosopher on a pedestal, and looks down on the plumber, is going to end up with neither the pipe, nor that philosophy is holding water!

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you, Andy.

Mr. Paul Mali: We also have Edward Meyer, who is the chairman of the education activities committee of the Chemical Industry Council of Connecticut. He is also attached to the American Cyanamid Corporation in Wallingford.

Rep. Douglas Fellows: Mr. Mali, I'd like to ask you a question, before this presentation, if I might? I'm representative Fellows. Are you people not saying that engineering technology is different from business technology, and you want to keep these distinct and separate? Is this not the crux of what you're saying?

Mr. Paul Mali: Absolutely. The technical institute program is a program that is designed to serve industry specifically. I don't mean with generalities, specifically Connecticut industry. Industries in this state, and we feel that any changes in this kind of policy would jeopardize the sources of manpower that we rely highly on.

Rep. Douglas Fellows: Well, this seems to me a matter of semantics. Those of us in the technical institute movement, believe in a degree which provides a degree of associate in engineering technology. We do considerably have this problem in the state of confusion between a vocational technical school, and a technical institute. And I think that what you're saying is that those should be separated, and, also, the technical institute and the community colleges should be separate, and considered as separate movements.

Mr. Paul Mali: Yes. They should be separate. The Community Colleges should be separate from the technical institutes. However, there should be a very close working relationship between the vocational technical schools, because this is the natural step of progression, for tradesmen, mechanics to go on to a post-secondary school. So, if anything, it should get closer to the vocational technical schools, as opposed to getting closer to community colleges, University of Connecticut, or other state institutions.

Mr. Edward H. Meyer: Madam chairman, Mr. LaGrotta, and members of the Committee. My name is Edward H. Meyer. I am chairman of the educational activities committee for the Chemical Council of Connecticut. This is an organization of thirty seven chemical companies, whose steering committee comprises, The American Cyanamid Company, the DuPont Company, Naugatuck Chemical, Charles Pfiser, The Dow Chemical Company, and Olin-Mattheison Company of New Haven. I work for American Cyanamid Company in Wallingford, where I am responsible for the technical publications covering the products that are manufactured at that division. Before that time, and this is my reason, in part, for being here, I had been a full time college chemistry teacher at two different two-year colleges: one in southern California for $4\frac{1}{2}$ years,

Mr. Edward H. Meyer, cont'd:

677

and I'm glad to be back in Connecticut, and prior to that for two additional years in the state of New York. I came to education from industry. So I would like to add to the statement which have already been made, these comments on my past professional teaching experience in two-year colleges. If you're a professional teacher you often like to ~~see~~ think of education as a process that changes the behavior of your students, (to which you can) and you think of yourself as offering some kind of standard to which you can help people who are your students rise, in the hopes that when they leave you, they'll do some things better than they would have done, had they not been there in your presence. And you hope, too, that you can do what education is really designed to do--stimulate interest, so that young people, and some older ones, too, will want to go on and learn for themselves. It's my opinion that the state technical institutes do achieve this purpose, and very well, to the benefit of the state's economy, to the benefit of the things achieved, its students, and the communities in which these very well prepared graduates become responsible, wage earning, tax paying citizens. I stand before you as something of a convert; allow me to explain that. As recently as late 1962, while I was teaching, the possibility that two-year colleges would be offering technical institute type education, although it wasn't defined as technical type education at the time, was described by the faculty, and my reaction as a faculty member, but honest reaction, and that of my colleagues, was essentially this: Well, why have it here, there are vocational schools for that purpose! I must admit, after seeing Connecticut's state technical institutes, that I, and my colleagues, were dead wrong! And I have since changed my mind. And I offer the prospect, that today, in the community colleges, which serve a very desirable purpose, and I would support those purposes with all the experience that I have behind me. But, in these institutions, one finds many liberal arts oriented faculty members and administrators, who might be expected to respond to the inclusion of technical institute type training in much the same way, as I honestly did, when I taught in a two-year college which did not offer this kind of education at the time. Now the people who might come to meet here in Connecticut, who administer the technical institute programs at the State Board of Education, and those who are in charge of the schools themselves, have exhibited very

Mr. Edward H. Meyer, cont'd:

678

strong interest, and very intelligent understanding of the needs of the industries, and of the institute's programs to meet those industries' purposes. There is, however, this point, and I believe it must be kept in mind, that there are very great contrasts between the two-year community colleges, and the twoyear technical institutes, although both offer the same degree upon completion of the two year program. They differ with respect of their purposes: their admission policies, the emphasis they place upon the programs they offer, the cost of their operation, their selection of faculty, and they deserve with respect to their concern with transfer to a four-year institution. I believe these differences make it desirable to continue the operation of the state technical institutes, separate from the community colleges and under the present State Boards of Education. One other point, that should be kept in mind because the technical institutes offer something of great wealth to Connecticut. A young person is give three excellent possibilities when he attends such a school, which he otherwise could not have. Technical institutes, like community colleges, serve to, in effect, if I may use the word, salvage young people, who have, for the first time, perhaps, to discover or even rediscover their abilities, to determine whether they can perform up to college level expectation without the competitive atmosphere of the four-year institution. Furthermore, he or she, can have AAS degree with an emmediate opportunity for responsible employment, or he or she can go on to a four-year institution as a junior. Now, we, of the Connecticut Chemical Council very recently had the privelege of cooperating with The State Department of Education in promoting greater public interest in technical institute education, and during this time, in support of my contention about the attitudes one might expect to find, we learned that many of Connecticut's high school counselors, administrators, and teachers welcomed the opportunity for the first time to see and learn about technical institutes and the opportunities that these institutes offered to their graduates. We believe the status of the technical institute and its education should be further raised to a new special and distinct position in Connecticut's educational picture. I'd like to emphasize once again the desirability of retaining state technical institutes under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education, whose efforts have created these schools that are models to this nation.

Mr. Edward H. Meyercont'd:

679

I thank the committee for the opportunity to present this statement.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Sir - it's interesting to note that in this attempt to create an agency of vitality, it is impossible for everyone to contribute much to it. We are quite aware of this situation, as I have indicated, in fact if you have other speakers who are making this same point, the point has been very well made. But it's an interesting sidelight, if your instructors had contacted us and would very much like to be with the higher education problem. However, this is just some of the forces that are centered against the Committee, and we should give that our consideration.

Mr. Edward H. Meyer: Well, in such a situation, everybody who has an honest difference of opinion, not only has a right to contribute it, but can lead very often to legislation that ultimately is a satisfactory compromise if necessary. We recognize that. Thank you.

Mr. Paul Mali: I would like to ask Mr. Jennings, who is the plant manager of the Dupont Corporation in Fairfield to make his statement.

Mr. Alfred Jennings: Madam chairman, and Mr. LaGrotta, ladies and gentlemen. I hope we're not wearing you out or snowing you under with all these industry talks. I won't be very long. My name is Alfred Jennings, and I am chairman of the Connecticut Chemical Industry Council, and manager of the Dupont plant in Fairfield. The Connecticut Industry Council consists of 37 chemical firms and laboratories throughout the state, so I speak to you now as an industrialist. The Connecticut Chemical Industry Council has undertaken a program to support the technical institutes. This support comprises building up and awareness of the institutes and their capabilities to school administrators, guidance counselors and science teachers. At the same time, we aim to increase the chemical industries awareness of these schools, so that they will make the very best possible use of the graduating technicians and technologists. These graduates represent increasingly important resources to industry in

Mr. Alfred Jennings, cont'd:

680

this state, and this is especially true in view of the mounting shortage of four-year technical graduates. At our plant we have found that one of these technologists, in a period where we just couldn't hire another four-year man, due to the shortage, came into the plant, and is doing, at this point, with some limitation, but not much, the full work of a regular four-year man. We like to feel that this effort of ours is born from. We co-sponsored a big conference in Norwalk State Technical Institute on January 28th where we had 500 members of industry and education there to hear the story of technical institute. Following that, we have learned that at Norfolk the applications for chemical technology have increased 7% and at Waterbury they have increased 10%. I point this out to show you that we are committed, and deeply interested in the state technical institutes. Moreover, we feel that the present administration under the vocational division of the Department of Education is capable, progressive and properly coordinated to the students and the needs of industry. The Chemical industry of Connecticut has a high regard for these institutes, and is highly pleased with the caliber and the performance of the technical institute graduates. Consequently, we are concerned about any change in the type of administration. After all, it's hard to quarrel with this kind of success. We have no objections to the broad features of this bill, and we feel that the Commission has done an excellent, an outstanding job in its studies. But we are concerned about the technical institutes, and it is our conviction that it would be unwise to place the administration of the state technical institutes under the same Board as the community colleges, because of specific industry oriented needs of the institutes may not be properly provided. We, therefore, sincerely recommend that administration of these institutes continue under the vocational division of the State Board of Education. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you very much. Can I just interrupt for a minute? I'd like to give you a choice, since we had said that we would recess at one, and I had promised that just as management has to go back to work, so does labor, and Mr. John Driscoll will be heard. Now, would you like to complete your speaking list with very brief statements, or would you prefer to come back and you may have the---

Mr. Paul Mali: We would prefer to complete our statements very briefly.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: All right. Fine. And then we will continue with Mr. Driscoll and Miss Rice.

Mr. Harmon E. Snoke: Chairman Schaffer, and chairman LaGrotta. I'm Harmon E. Snoke, executive vice president of the Manufacturers' Association of Bridgeport. We in Connecticut are rather late in getting in to this field of technical education, at the technical institute level. I was secretary of the Committee on Education in the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington from 1939 to 1944. Our first program was to be the inspiration shall I say, of technical education of this level throughout the United States, because at that time we realized there was a shortage of engineers, even then, and we needed at least two technicians for every engineer in the country. Now we're coming up to 1965, with probably the finest technical institutes in the country here in Connecticut. They're turning out what manufacturers need to supplement the still limited number of physicists, and other engineers and scientists. I happen to be on the (he says "brief", and I will be brief) and I don't want to belabor this. I happen to be on the engineering advisory committee which is our association committee at the University of Bridgeport, and the business advisory committee at both that school and the Fairfield University, and believe me--in the engineering institute we're making scientists engineers fast as the scientist level at the University of Bridgeport. There's no relationship to that in the liberal arts curriculum, and the two business schools. And the technical institute is something that fills a niche of its own, it fills a need, its geared to industry, and needs to be left within the State Board of Education at a point where what advisory committees they choose to have, it can perform its maximum function. Thank you.

Mr. Paul Mali: Madam chairman, I promise a very short statement by our plant manager, Ken Stober at Dow Chemical Corporation.

Mr. Ken Stober: Madam Chairman, members of the Education Committee. I will make it short. I oppose the movement of the technical institute from under the State Board of Education. Our relationship with the technical institute in Norwich Connecticut has been excellent. I've served on the Board as an advisory member. Thank you.

Mr. Paul Mali: Madam chairman, we have completed our statements, and we commend the committee, and we appreciate your patience in hearing us out on this bill.

682

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. May I say that the accent on the brevity at the end was in no, was by no means meant to cut the impact of your presentation, it was rather, in my mind, the point that you had made such an excellent presentation that you don't have to convince me any longer. May I now call on Mr. John Driscoll, president of the Connecticut State Labor Council?

Mr. John Driscoll: Madam chairman, Mr. chairman, patient members of the Committee. I'll be very brief. I'm in favor of the recommendations of the Commissioner on higher education as set forth in these bills. I think maybe you'll want to change them a little bit, after hearing testimony, but it seems to me that nobody here has really attacked the basic principle involved, which is that some central planning and budgetary agency is needed. I listened to Dr. Babbidge, and I got this message. I read Mr. Horowitz's dissenting opinion, and I got the same message, because he indicated that he thought the liaison committee that exists could be expanded to include public members, that they should be given policy making authority. Now, it seems to me that preferably the language of the bill about the Commission having responsibilities for planning organization of all state supported programs of higher education, and that the Committee should determine the nature of the programs to be offered at the several institutions within the system. And maybe you need to be more specific in defining the functions of each of the groupings, and maybe in response to the industry people, you would want to keep them under the Board of Education. It seems to me that there has to be, for your sake, and the Assembly, and you, representing the public, you have to have some evaluating authority, which can fit the requirements of demands of the various educational, professional people in the state. If you can rely on advice in making the final determination of how much is given, and how much of the,-- in a sense distributed. I don't see how you, as really part time volunteers, even though you have all the best will in the world, how you can, every two years, make these determinations, and be sure that you are doing the right kind of a job. I think that this Commission would give you the kind of expert advice and a kind of evaluation. It would help you to make the final determination. I don't think that this bill is really a test to criticize the State Board of Education or to criticize what has been done in the state universities or the state colleges. At least I don't interpret it that way. I think

Mr. John Driscoll, cont'd:

683

that because of the very nature of the present system that the Assembly has lagged in giving enough money. I think the people who talked from industry are absolutely right. Governor Snow was right. The big question is money. We're coming to the day when we will have 14 years of free public education. This is a policy plank of the AF of L and CIO. A hundred and twenty years organized labor has fought for free public education, and fought for its extension. We have no bias, except in favor of more of it. And I think that the question that you have to determine, you of the General Assembly, and this Committee, is how best to take care of the explosion that's coming in public higher education. To see to it that the development of community colleges is planned and programmed systematically and economically so that the public will get the most for their money. I think that's all that's being envisioned here, maybe I'm wrong, but I have the highest respect for the distinguished citizens who were on this Commission, and I know from Merlin Bishop how much time they put in, in making these studies. I was impressed by the advisory group's report and recommendations and I think that, you know, while we have done a good job, let's not be complacent. We have an annual deficit of 13,000 students, Connecticut students being educated outside the state over and above the number that are educated in the state. Connecticut standing so far down in the list of states in the amount of money spent for higher education. I think that one of the reasons for that is that we haven't had a central authority which could speak for all of the various educational new things in the state, and get the General Assembly to have confidence in that they were asking for a reasonable and equitable amount. I hope that this won't become an issue as between the status quo and those who want to author it. It really isn't that kind of an issue. It seems to me it's an issue of what's best for the future and not regarding what is being proposed as being somehow adversely critical of our progress of the past. Thank you very much.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you. Miss Rice?

Miss Ella E. Rice: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta, and other members of the joint Education Committee of the General Assembly. I'm Ella Rice, mathematics teacher and consultant in the Fairfield public schools and currently president of the Connecticut Education Association. The Connec-

Miss Ella Rice, cont'd:

684

ticut Education Association, representing a membership of 20,000 teachers, supports the creation of a coordinated system of higher education in Connecticut under an overall Commission for Higher Education. In expressing this support, the CEA would like to voice its appreciation to the Study Commission on higher education for its leadership in focusing the attention of Connecticut upon the greater need for educational opportunity at the post-secondary level, and to the several members of these joint committees for their efforts to produce a bill which will provide a dynamic leadership for all higher education in Connecticut. The CEA is convinced that the General Assembly has the opportunity to make an historic decision. While the CEA believes that SB 1341 and HB 4719 have provided the basis for consideration of needed legislation, we respectfully request the Education Committees of the House and Senate to give careful consideration to the following principles and propositions which we believe should be included in the rewriting of the bill prior to its passage by the General Assembly.

- 1) The bill should provide for an over-all coordinating, planning, policy-making body for all of Connecticut's higher education, so that the public interest will be best served, and there will be an orderly, logical and cooperative development of Connecticut's whole system of higher education, both public and private.
- 2) The bill should provide for the development of a system of state-supported community colleges which will make higher education freely available to citizens in every part of the state.
- 3) The bill should provide for three operating divisions, similarly constituted with parallel and equal powers, even though each may have different functions. Each of these divisions should have its own board of trustees: (a) the University of Connecticut, (b) the State Colleges, and (c) the Community Colleges.

The provisions of the bill should give these three divisions -- the three boards of trustees and their constituents units -- the same kind of legal basis. The language of the bill should be parallel, so that each board will have the same kind of relationship with the Commission for Higher Education as the other two boards. This means that the bill must include a general

Miss Ella Rice, cont'd:

685

provision for the University of Connecticut, so that there is no question as to its being under the Commission and on an equal level with the other coordinate divisions. To insure coordination and clear-cut channels of communication, each of the three boards of trustees should have representation, from among its membership, on the Commission for Higher Education.

- 4) The bill should provide general direction and powers for the Commission and its constituent divisions and should avoid specific limitations and restrictions on any of the boards or their units. The Commission and its operating divisions should be free to develop a coordinated system for Connecticut without such statutory fetters as limitations on degrees to be offered, numbers of scholarships to be granted, or amounts of tuition to be remitted, all of which are presently written into the bill.
- 5) The bill should provide as much local autonomy and institutional initiative as possible within the framework of a coordinated system of higher education. The three boards and their constituent institutions should have freedom to experiment educationally, to offer special services for their separate regions of the state, and have authority to receive and to expend funds from the federal government, industrial, philanthropic, or other organizations without these funds going through other state agencies, and to raise educational standards within the general policies established by the Commission and the budgets provided by the General Assembly. The executive officer for each board of trustees should be selected from the presidents of the constituent institutions to insure that local voices will be heard.
- 6) In view of existing federal legislation and the need for close correlation of technical and vocational education, the State Technical Institutes should remain, as at present under the control of the State Board of Education.
- 7) The bill should be scrutinized carefully to avoid language which will require the Commission to have a large, central, operating bureaucracy. Broad policy making, long-range planning, and general supervision should be the basic functions of the Commission. Administration and operational functions should be clearly assigned to the several boards and their constituent units.
- 8) Extraneous matters not directly related to

Miss Ella Rice, cont'd:

686

the system of higher education should be placed in a Part II of the bill. The sections in the bill related to the powers to be retained by the State Board of Education should be (placed in) brought together in a separate Part II. Part I should be solely concerned with the creation of the Commission for Higher Education, the coordinate boards of trustees under it, and the broad outlines of the organization of the state system of higher education.

The CEA respectfully requests your consideration for these eight principles in developing a revision of this bill for current enactment. In conclusion, the CEA is convinced that this can be a history-making moment, similar to that time a little over a hundred years ago when Henry Barnard led the way. This 1965 General Assembly has the power to create a coordinated system of higher education. May this Assembly see its function broadly in statesmanlike fashion, so that its handiwork will represent the strength and vision of a state eager to forge ahead educationally at the post-secondary level. We believe that adherence to the foregoing principles will best achieve the desired goal of a system of higher education in Connecticut which is dedicated to serving all of the people of the entire state. I thank you, and I would like to present Dean Earl Bixby, who is president of our Department of Higher Education.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: May I caution you that we have indicated that Miss Rice would be our last speaker. If you're prepared to be very, very brief --

Dean Earl Bixby: Could I have one minute? I am Earl M. Bixby the president of the Department of Higher Education of the Connecticut Education Association. This organization is comprised of about 300 professional educators, professors, and administrators from the various colleges of this state. It was this group that proposed the policies which Miss Rice has just conveyed to you, and may I say, with our heterogeneous group, that this policy came without any minority consideration. Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Thank you very much. We will now recess until one hour from now, which will be 2:15, and we will resume the hearing then. Thank you.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: The hearing will please come to order. Since we have finished our formal speakers, I will now hear most anybody. I would like to give preference to the president of the Community

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: cont'd:

687

College Association, Dr. Becker, if you care to speak at this point.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Mr. chairman, we don't wish to pre-empt time. I understood from Senator Schaffer that the order to be followed was an alphabetical one, and that Manchester came before Norwalk. So we will yield to Manchester.

Dean Frederick W. Lowe, Jr.: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. Connecticut presently has a trade deficit of some 13,000 college students. This means that 13,000 more Connecticut high school graduates are forced to seek a place to continue their education outside of the state, than are students from other states finding college openings within Connecticut. How are we to solve the problem of assuring that all Connecticut youth who deserve it will have the opportunity for higher education? The State obviously faces the need for a great expansion of its higher education facilities, and it seems to me that the bill before this Committee today offers the best chance of assuring that that needed expansion will take place in an orderly, logical manner, with the most economical allocation of resources to the most reasonable balance of facilities to supply the multitudinous variety of higher education opportunities necessary to the future growth of the state's economy. Community colleges are one form of higher education institution which can most quickly and most economically provide higher education opportunities for large numbers of students with widely varying abilities. Already the two municipally operated community colleges of Norwalk and Manchester have accommodated over a thousand of those Connecticut students for whom there was no room in the other public institutions of higher learning in the State. But these students have been accommodated at high cost to themselves--around three times the tuition at other public colleges -- and at a cost to already overburdened municipalities which has prevented their speedy growth and sound development. With a thorough system of state support, these colleges and others like them could develop rapidly and efficiently to accommodate many thousands of Connecticut youth for whom their programs would be most fitting. These community colleges can provide not only the first two, unspecialized years of many baccalaureate programs, discovering the most suited and transferring them to the public and private four-year institutions; they can

Dean Fred Lowe, cont'd:

688

supply not only much of the adult education and retraining required by our rapidly changing economy; but they can provide the semi-professional and technical programs of post-secondary education that are more and more required before most high school graduates can earn a satisfying living and become substantial contributors to Connecticut's economy instead of remaining a financial drain on that economy. The Experience of Manchester Community College has been one of doubling enrollments: from 120 in its first year, to 220 in its second year, to an estimated 350-400 in its third year; with students coming presently from 27 towns in the area. Next fall the college will offer 9 or 10 different curricular programs, both for transfer to professional courses, and for immediate, productive employment. Many of these students would have gone to no college if Manchester hadn't been in existence. But the town of Manchester has about reached the limit of its resources to support the capital development and expansion of program necessary to accomodate the growing flood of applicants and the great variety of their needs. Without the support of a sound system of state support such as is proposed by this bill, the growth of Manchester Community College will be slow and limited, surely inadequate to the demands which will be placed upon it. With the support of a state system such as is proposed in this bill, not only will it be possible to respond to demand from the greater Hartford area for the higher education opportunities that can be offered by a community college, but students from areas not presently accessible to a community college may be offered the opportunity to develop their abilities to the fullest possible extent. Thank you.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: May I ask a couple of questions, please?

Mr. Lowe, I'm Lucy Hammer of the 12th district. Under the bills in the General Assembly, putting this bill aside, under the bills for the community colleges that are before the Assembly, asking for state help for the present community colleges, would the tuition still stay high like this figure that you have now of \$550. per pupil, or \$500. per pupil?

Dean Fred Lowe: Well, there is a bill proposed by representatives Cavagnaro and Groobert from Manchester which speaks only of a state system of community colleges at the same tuition level as prevailed at the other state institutions.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: That would be the same type of thing we have in mind in this bill?

Dean Fred Lowe: That's correct. Other bills, in my view, are "make-piece" bills, which would leave it difficult to predict what the tuition would be.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: I haven't had time to look up them carefully. They're some of them for construction, aren't they?

Dean Fred Lowe: Some are for adding to the present state school building law, a 50% capital construction cost for community colleges, and if it were possible to have some guarantee that these community colleges could successfully compete for the 40% grants under the federal higher education facilities act, this would be nice. However, the experience in the first round of distributing these funds has been that the total amount allotted to Connecticut went to two-year branches of the state of Connecticut, who proclaimed themselves not to be community colleges.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Yes, I think this is very interesting, don't you? They're not community colleges to the purposes of an overall structure, but they're community colleges for the purpose of getting federal grants.

Dean Fred Lowe: At the same time, Norwalk Community College had a request in for funds, and received none, as I understand.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Then I want to ask you, are there highschool teachers on your faculty?

Dean Fred Lowe: There are some, I think a minimum; I think less than majority. In some cases we have, I suppose, we have been guilty of rating the best teachers in the high schools. I think it probably is ~~no~~ necessary for community colleges to seek some kind of balance, (because surely somewhere in between) between the classroom oriented instructor and the research oriented instructor at the university, because surely somewhere in between is the range and proper level of community college instruction.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: The other question is: would you give us just briefly the range of the programs and courses you offer? I'm particularly interested in occupational and vocational.

Dean Fred Lowe: Right, in addition to the transfer liberal arts program, we offer courses in business administration, accounting, executive secretary, a basic technical course, which is designed at the engineering technician. We will be offering a marketing course, we will be offering an insurance technology course next fall. We are applying for federal vocational education funds to support courses in medical secretary fields, the field of laboratory technician, dental assistant and data processing programmer for business. One of the difficulties, now that you bring this up, that I think faces this Committee, when it has to make a decision about keeping the technical institutes in the Board of Education purview is that the vocational education people in the State Board control the dispensation of federal vocational education funds throughout the state. I would be very worried about the possibility of community colleges getting federal vocational education funds, unless some statutory adjustment were made so that not all of the funds could be controlled strictly by the State Board of Education.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Even if the, you mean, of course if the State Board has control of the community colleges, that would be one thing. You mean if they were under another control you would be afraid they would not have funds channeled through?

Dean Fred Lowe: Or if the technical institutes remained under the State Board and the community colleges were outside of this, with the State Board controlling the flow of federal vocational educational funds.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Thank you.

Rep. Arline Ryan: May I ask a question? Representative Ryan from Branford. You say the State Board of Education controls the funds. Does the State Board of Education control your curriculum?

Dean Fred Lowe: To a certain extent. Programs which are to be supported by federal vocational education funds, certain percentages of strictly trainee as opposed to general education courses in a given program are required by the regulations of the State Board, and its vocational education branch which determine the eligibility of an institution or program for that federal assistance.

Rep. Arline Ryan: Do you have any autonomy as far as (the) to say what your curricular is going to be, other than your federal programs?

Dean Fred Lowe: There is autonomy within limits established. That is, let us say, a principle were established that in a terminal vocational program, 60% of the courses should be strictly training, not general education. The individual community college would have autonomy beyond that limit, but not below that limit.

Rep. Philip Doran: I have previously understood that the community colleges would accent the liberal arts, but I believe you've just explained that the community college would also undertake an engineering technician course of some sort, is this right?

Dean Fred Lowe: This is correct.

Rep. Philip Doran: In what respect do you think this might be duplicated by the technical institutes? Or would it be a duplication of any sort?

Dean Fred Lowe: I think it is quite possible that if the legislation that comes out of this Session of the Assembly, leaves the community colleges under two different governing boards, that it is practically obvious that there will be duplications. They will be competing institutions and that this is the reason why I am tempted to support the present bill which proposes that both the technical institutes and the community colleges be under one board, to leave the technical institutes as independent and narrowly focused technical institutes and to build a system of community colleges other than technical institutes, and that there need not be a change in the nature of the technical institutes or the nature of the community colleges just because both are under the same boards, any more than there is change in the fact that Danbury State Teachers College prepares music supervisors, and New Haven State Teachers College prepares art supervisors, and neither does the other.

Rep. Philip Doran: Isn't it true that one of the advantages and objectives of the community college is this ability to transfer later perhaps to a four-year school? Do you have the record of how many transfers of this type Manchester has had happen?

Dean Fred Lowe: Very limited, since we will be graduating our first class, our first two-year program this June, but we have had students presently accepted, some of them only one years students, at about three colleges, University of Vermont, Willimantic State College and Bay Path, a junior college for transfer as a freshman.

Rep. Philip Doran: Well, when they transfer, presumably at the beginning of all this is that lots of these youngsters have no college to go to.

Dean Fred Lowe: Correct.

Rep. Philip Doran: Justification for community college, and for several reasons, usually they don't make the requirements to get into a standard four year college. Now on the transfer from the community college after two years there, to what year would they go in the four-year college, would you suppose?

Dean Fred Lowe: Generally speaking, they would go into their junior year. Transfer operations are always done on a course by course basis, that is, nobody transfers a whole year package. They transfer a year of chemistry, or two semesters of mathematics, but generally speaking, and it has been our experience so far, and I am sure that the Norwalk people can give you much more documentation on this than we can. They have transferred with full transfer credit for all courses in which the student received grades of C or better. No transfer for below that grade.

Rep. Philip Doran: Seems to be somewhat of an anomaly, in that these same children who couldn't get into the freshman year of the four-year course, could go to the community college, take two years there, and go right into the junior year of the four year college.

Dean Fred Lowe: I think there may be two answers to that. One is,--maybe three. One is that obviously the present state institutions are being forced by limitations of facilities to be more and more restrictive in their selection. Students who would have been admitted to the University of Connecticut five years ago, are not admitted now, and may very well come to the community college. Five years ago they would have been admitted as freshmen, and progressed to be juniors in the University of Connecticut. Second answer is that in many cases it is possible for the community colleges to provide superior instruction in the freshman and sophomore years. These are the

Dean Fred Lowe: cont'd:

693

general unspecialized years, when the tendency at large state universities, in many freshman and sophomore introductory courses, is to use graduate assistants, whereas, for instance, in our case, we are teaching freshman chemistry, and physics, with research physicists and chemists from United Aircraft Research Laboratories.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: What--and how big is the class?

Dean Fred Lowe: Classes I think probably are very much smaller. I think our chemistry class is about 15 now, our physics class is about 10.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: Since there is such a low number of students, in the class, and apparently they are receiving practically individual instruction, because the classes are so small, what is the mortality rate? How many of them drop out? Before they complete their two year course?

Dean Fred Lowe: Mortality rate is very high, and it is high in the ratio that used to prevail in the large mid-western universities who were required by statutes to admit all high school graduates. Roughly, this is what we tend to do, consequently there is a high mortality rate. The justification, we would argue, in behalf of this mortality rate, is a matter of democratic principle, I think, which is that every child should have all the chances he is willing to ask for, and fight for, not necessarily all the degrees he is willing to ask for, but every chance that he's willing to try. Consequently we have the tendency to admit people who are clearly risks, academic risks. But we do, and someone this morning, I think, spoke of the community college and the technical institute as the kind of salvage operation. I think there is this benefit to society, that many student who would have gone to no college, maybe a small percentage, but numbers are salvaged from non-skilled labor.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: I see. Well, the thing that intrigues me is that this morning many of the speakers mentioned as a salient reason for supporting this program was that they would get those potential drop-outs, who would become potential delinquents if they weren't educated. It seems to me that what they should have is a curriculum

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer, cont'd:

694

adopted to these young people. For instance, there is a tremendous hue and cry for automotive service workmen, because the young people are just not trained in that field, etc.

Dean Fred Lowe: This is one of the main reasons that we are interested in getting strong state support. Our aim at Manchester would be to expand the variety of vocational programs to infinity, on the theory that we should be able to say to every high school graduate: "We have some program that is appropriate to your ability and to your aspirations".

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: May I ask a question? In view of this high ratio of drop-outs, don't you think that this poses a particular problem in terms of investment of tax dollars?

Dean Fred Lowe: Well, I suppose it obviously does. But the choice is one of not offering a chance to a percentage of the state's high school graduates as opposed to the possibility of preserving 10, 20, 30, whatever the percentage is, of them for a fuller life, for a higher occupational opportunity and I suppose, on the strictly pragmatic level, then for the possibility for greater contribution to the state financially eventually. Now, perhaps I've overemphasized the drop-out rate. I gather that national statistics indicate that something like 50% of the students, private, public, four-year institutions alike, do not graduate with baccalaureate degrees. I would think our drop-out rate in the two year program is something like 50%--maybe it's 40, maybe it's 60. So I'm not sure that we're that much different from the survival rate in the four-year institutions.

Rep. William Blake: I didn't get your name, sir, when you started.

Dean Fred Lowe: Oh yes. Frederick Lowe, dean at Manchester Community College. I'm sorry.

Rep. William Blake: Representative Diefenderfer raised a question which has some interesting implications here. Most of our, or all of our vocational technical training schools offer courses which are partially liberal arts, if you will, basic high school, plus a combination of various fields which are of a trade nature, in which a boy or girl can study. But it's my further understanding that if you don't participate well in the liberal art field, that you will not stay in school.

Rep. William Blake, cont'd:

695

Dr. Fay can correct me on this. I think you have to pass the courses, and I'm wondering if we get the situation where a young person who would try to get into the vocational training schools, in the high school level now, and is not successful in staying there, are you suggesting that perhaps we would be offering parallel courses in the community college level, that would permit them to continue in the vocational aspects of the training program that they couldn't participate in in high school?

Dean Fred Lowe: I think we do not, at present, offer such courses, what we try to do for students such as those you mention, is to offer courses of a remedial nature. Let us say a student who has had difficulty in secondary school in mathematics, which prevents him from handling some technical courses of a college level. We do offer what we consider to be non-credit or pre-college courses in mathematics. It is the same in English, and we hope to expand this kind of thing. But these are courses which are, in effect, remedial and attempting to build up these students to the level at which they can handle college level courses, whether these be academic or vocational in orientation.

Rep. William Blake: Well, I think we're talking in terms of terminal students, as far as the community college and training level is concerned, and I guess I'll restate my question. It appears to me that it would be possible that a student could not participate successfully in one of our high schools vocational training programs and find that there was a part of that total program in vocational aspects available to them at the post-secondary level, and if this were so, it appears that we have a duplication of effort here that might pose something of a problem. There are a good many people over the years who have thought that our so called vocational training schools at the high school level were really places where students who couldn't handle themselves in the standard high school, could go to school. Well this isn't the case. Now, we're talking again about the student who cannot participate successfully in the high school program, and probably would not participate very successfully in the college program. And I'm just wondering whether your idea of community college level expands to the concept of providing just the vocational aspects of what was a total high school program.

Dean Fred Lowe: Let me try this answer on you, sir. We do offer two kinds of possibilities. One is the possibility which leads to an associate degree, which is the kind of certification of certain qualities. This degree, in our view, includes the kind of general education which makes for an improved citizen, as well as an improved worker. We do, on the other hand, offer as many as we can afford to offer, courses that you might call continuing education, that you might call retraining, that are specific individual courses. I mentioned some introductory courses in data processing, for instance, which we happen to offer, do not lead to a degree, but along the lines that someone has started to work, or someone wishes to work, that these would not wind up with an associate degree as certain a general program. Is that anywhere near the ----

Rep. Wm. Blake: Let me be specific. You wouldn't envision that the Manchester Community College would be setting up a program in automotive servicing similar to the one in the Norwalk vocational technical training high school?

Dean Fred Lowe: Certainly not similar. No. When it comes to the time when a secondary school trained auto mechanic is not sufficiently trained to handle the requirements of that job, we would think then there was a possibility for post-secondary education.

Rep. Wm. Blake: All right. Thank you, sir. I have just one general question. As this bill is presented to us, there is a planning and coordinating function given to this (committee) commission, and under this commission there would be a board which would cover community colleges and technical institutes. Now the location of technical institutes is derived through a study procedure established by the State Board, and in collaboration with industry in that particular area, which pretty well defines where the school should be, and what subjects should be taught there. Is it, in your mind, that this same procedure would be undertaken with community colleges, or would this be left to a certain amount of local initiative, and if this is the case, how then does this board control it?

Dean Fred Lowe: I would think, obviously, the purpose of this bill is to assure that the future development of a community college system is based on the same kind of thorough investigation of the geographical need for the distribution of these colleges. I say future on the assumption that the two existing ones, as the bill provides,

Dean Fred Lowe: cont'd:

697

would be incorporated into that structure from the beginning. Does that answer your question?

Rep. Wm. Blake: Thank you.

Rep. Dorothy Hutton: Your testimony here has really been a revelation to me, because I had no idea that the community colleges were entering or planning to enter, to the extent that you have mentioned, into the vocational education field, and you also said, if I understood your testimony correctly, that you hoped that they'd become statutory provision for them to apply for federal funds. Now, if I understood the testimony correctly, this morning, the federal regulations follow that federal funds can only go from one board of vocational education in the state, and that board has been designated as the State Board of Education, that's a federal regulation. Would you care to comment on that?

Dean Fred Lowe: Yes. I don't think we can emphasize too strongly how much committed to vocational education the community colleges are. It is, I think, quite possible, in the state of Connecticut, to establish a system under a single board, which supervises both the technical institutes and the community colleges to devise the kinds of vocational education that each might be concerned with. For instance, because of the presence of very strong technical institutes in Connecticut, we are concentrating on the office education, or service vocation programs. Now, the problem that you're raising is how do you get these federal funds distributed on an equal basis?

Rep. Dorothy Hutton: Bearing in mind the fact that we have this system of vocational technical schools on the secondary level, who get funds. Now you bring up another question. Now you're going to correlate the programs with the secondary level with the community colleges that you're talking about, to man the technical institutes, if you had them under two boards.

Dean Fred Lowe: That's what I think is the problem, and that's why we would recommend that the technical institutes, at least on this level, and the community colleges, be under a single board.

Rep. Dorothy Hutton: Yes, but the program would still leave the vocational technical schools under the secondary level under the State control.

Dean Fred Lowe: That is correct.

Rep. Dorothy Hutton: So I'm asking how (inaudible)

Dean Fred Lowe: There is, I believe, an advisory council of-- a vocational advisory council which advises the vocational education section of the State Board with respect to the distribution of these funds. These funds are allocated to secondary and to post secondary. We are presently seeking funds-- The Manchester Community College is presently seeking funds through the State Board of Education for support of vocational education programs, and we have had cooperation insofar as the non-technical vocations are concerned. But it still would be possible for a separate board, I think, to act through the State Board of Education, if that's it, but I would really like to see some statutory provisions for this.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Thank you, Dean Lowe. Any one else care to speak from Manchester? Well then, in alphabetical order we will go to Norwalk. We will entertain you in any manner you wish.

Mrs. Walter Hall:

I'm Mrs. Walter Hall from Norwalk and member of the Citizens Advisory Council of the Norwalk Community College. At the March 25th meeting of the advisory council, this council is composed of 75 members, the following resolution was passed: "We, the members of the Citizens Advisory Council of the Norwalk Community College, having had four years of successful experience as the policy-making body of the Norwalk Community College, are fully convinced of the need for the growth of public community colleges with state financial support. For the following reasons, we do hereby go on record as being against SB 1341 and HB 4719, "An act concerning establishing a state system of higher education." as introduced in the current session of the Connecticut State Legislature: We see no need to change the present state philosophy and laws for control of public education of which the two year community college is a natural extension. At local and regional levels, present laws allow maximum cooperation among local and regional boards and agencies. At the state level, the Connecticut State Board of Education has the assistance of a strong and effective council on higher education in setting and maintaining educational standards. SB 1341 and HB 4719 would reduce local responsibility and initiative, make community colleges less responsive to local needs, virtually eliminate voluntary contributions of money and service, and increase

Mrs. Walter Hall, cont'd:

immensely the problems of sharing the use of expensive community resources. The Secretary of the Citizens Advisory Council of the Norwalk Community College is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the members of the joint committees on Education at the Connecticut State Legislature, Hartford, Connecticut." Additional testimony will be heard from four gentlemen from Norwalk, who will speak on plans for expanding opportunities for higher education. They are in order:
Mr. Joseph Beatman -- Dean Everett Baker --
Dr. Harry Becker -- Dr. John Lund.

Mr. Joseph Beatman: Senator Schaffer, representative LaGrotta, members of the joint board. I am Joseph W. Beatman, a native of Hartford and a resident of Norwalk. I wish to go on record as opposed to SB 1341 and HB 4719. I am interested in young people and in helping to provide opportunities for them to obtain the education and training that is needed to make something worth while of their lives. For four years, I have been active in the Norwalk Community College where I have served as chairman of the scholarship committee and as a member of the executive committee of the policy making body. I have been very much impressed by the effect that the college has had on the community as well as by the good that it has done for the students. The Norwalk Community College is one of the most important developments in the history of Norwalk. It has become a rallying point for people of every background and station of life. The college has lifted local pride and many fine citizens have come forward to work and to give to the college. For example, we have received a single gift of \$100,000. to help build a new building. We also have many smaller gifts for our scholarship program and library. I believe that community colleges need to be community controlled as well as community serving. Only if they are community controlled can there be maximum cooperative use of expensive community facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, science laboratories and athletic fields. I sincerely hope that you will find a way to modify the proposed legislation so that the development of community colleges is encouraged without putting them under state operating control. Please don't take the community interest away from the community college.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: I just want to ask you, if it doesn't trouble you that your students have to pay three times as much as the freshmen and sophomores at your state colleges and universities?

Mr. Joseph Beatman: Yes, it does. It troubles us very much. It is because of that that we started a scholarship fund. This fund is supported entirely by public donations, and when I say public, we have never gone out on a drive. People know, their neighbor students going, they know they can't afford to pay, and so they have made small contributions to the scholarship fund. We are very much concerned with the number of students who are scared away from our college. We now have almost 800 students there. We have no way of knowing how many students, how many more students we would have had if our tuition had been in the neighborhoods of \$200. or \$100. That is a very important consideration.

Rep. Arline Ryan: May I ask a question? You have complete autonomy as far as your curricular is concerned, right?

Mr. Joseph Beatman: That is something I think we have. That is something I would prefer Dean Baker answer.

Rep. Arline Ryan: All right, I'll ask him. Thank you.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Sir, you indicated that because of the generosity of the community, it enabled you to do many things. What are the chances of a community college being developed where they did not have that support?

Mr. Joseph Beatman: I think that if they did not have that support, the students who now apply to us for scholarship aid, and we have a standard that's a pretty rigid one, we give scholarship aid to any student admitted if that student says to us: "I will not be able to attend your college unless I have part of my tuition paid." Now, these students I know, might not be able to go to a community college if there is no scholarship program in that community college.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: You come from a rather wealthy part of the state. Would you envisage the same kind of support for a community college if this were, say in eastern Connecticut, which is more sparsely populated. Would you also go a step further, and on the basis of your opposition to this particular bill for the state support of community colleges, would you not see this, in a way, denying the same kind of community college education which you are giving

Sen. Gloria Schaffer, cont'd:

701

to the people in the Norwalk area, you would be denying this to other citizens of the state?

Mr. Joseph Beatman: Actually, I think that the, while I mentioned this \$100,000. gift, let me stress that the gift and the contributions that we have received to aid students, have been from \$1., \$2., or \$5., up. I don't think that the fact that we're in Fairfield County would make any difference, because the community interest was generated in other parts of the state to this sort of contribution.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I just want to go on record as disagreeing with that statement, since if one looks around the state, one will see a concentration of services in the more heavily developed areas, and a lack of services in the others.

Rep. Philip Doran: Mr. Beatman? Doran of Berlin. I'm not awfully sure I understand this correctly. At Norwalk you have what I would gather a self sufficient, self sustaining operation in its community college? at this time?

Mr. Joseph Beatman: Yes.

Rep. Philip Doran: Very commendable, sir.

Dean Everett Baker: Everett Baker, dean of the Norwalk Community College. Senator Schaffer, and representative LaGrotta, and members of the joint commission, committee. I'm going to make my remarks somewhat limited, since I will be followed by two other speakers, and I want to be sure that they have plenty of time. I think that one of the things that I might testify to is that in the actual administration of the college, local control has meant a maximum of flexibility, has enabled us to move quickly when there was need to move quickly, has made it possible for us to respond to local desires and wishes. Let me give you one or two examples of this. In our community college, basically a liberal arts college, and this was the interest of the community when it was established. At the beginning of our very first year, however, before we actually opened, the local chamber of commerce indicated that it was essential in town that we have an executive secretarial program. And in spite of the fact that we would have liked to wait another year until we had our feet soundly on the ground, we instituted an executive secretarial program immediately. A program, I

Dean Everett Baker, cont'd:

702

would point out, however, and this is true of our other so called vocational programs in the field of business administration, a program in which 50% of the work remains in liberal arts. And in all of our business administration programs, we are trying to turn out people who are not technicians in a particular area or subject, who are well rounded individuals, who may go out on the junior executive level, or if they desire, continue on to the four-year college. We start business administration the second year with the executive secretarial, with some other courses in business administration, and with accounting. We plan to increase offerings here as rapidly as we could since there was an obvious need in the local community for this. And I might say that when I say local community, I am referring to the greater Norwalk community, that is to Norwalk and the surrounding communities of Darien, Canaan, Westport, Wilton. It does not limit where our students come from, but this is the primary area. Actually our students have come everywhere from Stratford to Greenwich, and as far inland as Washington Depot. I could mention a few far ones, such as India, and the rest, but these are curiosities, almost. Let me give you an example of how we have taken advantage of the opportunity to expand the business administration program, and how being able to work with technical institutes under the state department, of education. We have moved rapidly and successfully. When it became obvious that there would be federal funds available under vocational education act of 1963, we immediately began discussions with officials of the State Department of Education, and with the close cooperation, and many hours of work and advice, from people in the State Department, we developed a program under which we have finally been allotted \$107,000. to buy equipment, so that we may expand our business education program for the greater Norwalk area. The City of Norwalk, on the other hand, has been doing its part, and there is an eight room elementary building in excellent condition, requires slight, only very slight modifications, which the Board of Education no longer needs for elementary education, and, provided a little strike we're having down there by carpenters doesn't hold it up too much, will be turned over to the Norwalk Community College within a couple of weeks for its business education center. Industry has been trying to buy this building for anywhere from \$250,000. up for some time.

Dean Everett Baker, cont'd:

703

I think this is an indication of the kind of support that we are getting from the city officials as well as private citizens in this program. Another indication of the cooperation that is possible, by having the technical institutes and the community colleges under one board, I think, can be seen in the data-processing program, which we are going to offer in our business center. At first I had held back from offering this, because there is a data processing program at the Norwalk State Technical Institute. However, as we talked this over on the state level, it became obvious that they were doing one type of data-processing, they were interested primarily in the scientific, technical applications, and we were urged to go ahead with applications for business and industry, and this is what we are planning to do. We are also planning to use the computer at the Norwalk State Technical Institute, since there is no need, for our purposes, at this time, to duplicate that kind of expensive equipment. I think that our experience, at least, under the State Board of Education, with accreditation by the State Board, and the Connecticut Council on Higher Education, has been that we have had great freedom in establishing the curricular that our local people want. At the same time, we have been brought up to the standards that are set by the Connecticut Council on Higher Education, and the State Department of Education. There are other ways by which we can move quite rapidly too. We have had, every year, the problem of guessing what the expansion would be for the next year, and this, in turn, means guessing what we need by way of administrative staff, and faculty. All of our council members who are active in the executive committee particularly have a chance to meet with me informally on committees in various ways, and over the past year we have been talking about possible administrative expansion for next year. As a result of the business education expansion which became possible with this federal grant, last Thursday night, I proposed specific new additions to the administrative staff to the executive committee of the Citizens Advisory Council. They were approved at that time, they are on their way to the Norwalk Board of Education tomorrow night, where we anticipate that they will be approved and within a matter of days, we will have the job announcements out. This, I think, is one of the advantages of local control.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: You people in Norwalk are against this bill that's before the Committee, and you're very proud of your community support and control of your institution in Norwalk, and possibly so, in fact it seems you have done a marvelous job. But I'm a little bit puzzled, because this bill does not affect you, and unless you wish it to. And therefor, I am wondering why you are showing so much concern in Norwalk?

Dean Everett Baker: I think it does effect us very directly. We are as much concerned as anyone else in the state, because, as Mr. Beatman said, even though we offer scholarships, we're quite certain there are people who are frightened away, who do not come, they simply know it costs money. We are not anxious to have our students paying approximately \$500. tuition. I believe, when the enabling act was passed, that was in 1959, that there were members of the legislature then, who voted against the bill saying that we know that you'll be back from Norwalk pretty soon for state aid, if we do pass this. Well we are back, we were back in the last legislature. We believe that state aid is necessary.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: You wish to keep the present situation, but have state aid to help you.

Dean Everett Baker: Yes, we believe that state aid is possible under the present laws.

Sen. Lucy Hammer: Thank you.

Rep. Kathleen Tracy: Do you have any plan for what kind of participation --(inaudible) or, any idea of what you --- or have you one of your bills?

Dean Everett Baker: Well, I believe there have been two or three bills in, and I would rather leave that to Dr. Becker. I know he has planned to say something about this. I don't want to duplicate.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I just wanted to ask what your range of tuition was?

Dean Everett Baker: Our range of tuition. Well, we charge \$14. a credit hour, and for someone who lives outside the city of Norwalk, an additional \$2. per credit, and this is to provide some compensation for the use of the buildings, and such, which is provided for by the tax payers in Norwalk. And this comes with fees, and such to about \$500. a year. May I read one other statement, which I did almost forget?

Dean Everett Baker, cont'd:

705

I've been asked to read this statement from the Norwalk PTA Council, and it is signed Mrs. Rudolph Springer, chairman of the Community College Committee, and Philip Segal, president of the Norwalk PTA Council. "The Community College Committee of the Norwalk PTA Council opposes SB 1341 and HB 4719, an act concerning establishing a state system of higher education. The Norwalk Community College was established through the efforts of the entire community, because of the great need of a college in this area. The present enrollment of over 800 students proves this need. The tremendous local support, both by volunteer workers and voluntary contributions, has been expanded to a sense of city pride and community involvement in the College. SB 1341 and HB 4719 would, we feel, weaken the traditionally successful local state relationship." If there are no further questions, I would like to introduce the president of our college, the superintendent of schools in Norwalk, Dr. Harry A. Becker, who has been a distinguished educator in Connecticut for more than 30 years. I think it's extremely important in listening to his remarks to remember that he has had a great deal of experience in higher education, as well as K through 12. He has been college professor, junior college dean, and university dean. He has been directly responsible for establishing several of the units at the University of Bridgeport. He was at one time an instructor of a course called "The Community College" at New York University. He has been at Norwalk for 12 years, and when he came there, he was determined that there would be a community college, and I'm very happy and proud, therefore, to present him to you at this time.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Senator Schaffer, chairman LaGrotta, it's a pleasure to appear before this distinguished group, and I want to commend not only the study committee that has done an exceptionally strong job in highlighting the needs for higher education, because there certainly is no question about the needs for expansion of opportunities for post-secondary education. And I want to express my sympathy and admiration for this group for your patience and fortitude as you sit here, and sit here, and sit here. It is my privilege to make three reports to you this afternoon, and the first I make in my capacity as president of the newly organized Connecticut Association for Public Community Colleges. In this connection I

Dr. Harry A. Becker: cont'd:

want to say that the report is limited to resolutions passed on March 15, 1965. Resolution No. 1:

"Resolved that this meeting express its support of broader higher educational opportunities in Connecticut, particularly through the creation and development of a system of State supported regional community colleges, with due provision for local governing boards, and, be it further resolved that a delegation consisting of the chairman of each Community College Board and Study or Planning Committee, or their representatives be formed to meet with a representative of the State Study Commission on Higher Education to discuss enabling legislation."

And I think I can add as a footnote that the meeting referred to in the above resolution was held, and although there was a useful exchange of views, no agreement was reached. The second resolution is:

"Whereas students in the public community colleges urgently need the benefits of low tuition; whereas there is a great need to provide improved facilities in the public community colleges; therefor, be it resolved that irrespective of legislative action on proposals to revise the system of state control, this meeting go on record as supporting legislation to reduce tuition charges for public community college students and to provide State aid for community college buildings."

This completes my first report. The second report is a resolution passed by the Norwalk Board of Education on April 6, 1965, which they have directed me to bring to your attention.

"Whereas, the Norwalk Board of Education has given much consideration to the need and problems of post-secondary education for a number of years; whereas it is legally the sponsoring agency of the Norwalk Community College, which under the direction of the Advisory Council has been a dramatic success for the past four years; therefor be it resolved after due deliberation, that The Norwalk Board of Education go on record as being against SB 1341 and HB 4719. Be it further resolved, that it is in the public interest for operational control to be kept at the local level although it is recognized that ultimate control of all public education resides in the state. Unanimously approved."

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

My third report, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, is a personal one. I might say, as a followup of the very kind introduction by Dean Baker, that I was born in Connecticut, I have lived practically all of my life in Connecticut, and I have spent some 20 years as a student of the community college movement. / I wish to go on record as opposed to SB 1341 and HB 4719. Ladies and gentlemen, community colleges should be of and by the people of the community, as well as for them. I believe that there is a better way to develop and control community colleges than that proposed in the bill. The better way recognizes that ultimate control resides in the State, but operational control is placed at the local level. The Better way sets up a partnership of the local community and the State. State financial assistance should be used to encourage and stimulate our traditional Connecticut local initiative rather than to erode and weaken local efforts. Comments have been made about Norwalk, and there have been references perhaps, or at least, implications that Norwalk is wealthy. Ladies and gentlemen, if you were to look at the equalized grand list figures of the state tax commissioner, you will find that Norwalk is only slightly above the state average in per pupil assessment, equalized. The city of Bridgeport has much higher wealth, but much lower support of education, than the city of Norwalk. There isn't a perfect correlation between means and effort, and there is a question of public policy and the issue of public policy is: Will the huge power and resources of the state encourage and stimulate local effort, or cause the local people just to turn their backs on them and to say let those in Hartford do the whole job. There's more ways than one to do this, as we look around the fifty states. An example of a highly successful program in which community colleges are clearly a local responsibility is the Florida system. Florida has a highly successful community college program, and I provide two pages containing pertinent quotations from the report entitled, "Five Years of Progress--Florida's Community Junior Colleges--Their Contributions and Their Future." In Florida during the past ten years, community colleges have had an orderly but spectacular growth. One of the recommendations on the basis of considerable experience is, "Florida's junior community colleges should continue their present role as locally controlled institutions..."

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

Another outstanding community college with an interesting control structure which emphasizes local control and participation by an industry is the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City. I provide a quotation from their literature on their organization. The Fashion Institute of Technology is sponsored by the Board of Education of the City of New York, operating under a board of Trustees, with the active participation of the Educational Foundation of the Garment industry and in coordination of the state plan of the city of New York. Now, actually I am not suggesting that Connecticut community colleges be a carbon copy exactly of Florida, or The Fashion Institute of Technology. Dean Baker did not mention it, but in Norwalk we consider (it to be) our community college to be primarily a liberal arts institution. We are in the field of business administration. We are in the field with total cooperation of the State Board of Education and with our local supporting business and industry. We are totally outside of technical education. We will never be in the field of technical education. We will never duplicate the programs of the Norwalk State Technical Institute. Ladies and gentlemen, I offer the illustrations of the Florida Community Colleges and the Fashion Institute of Technology, and I should offer other illustrations to demonstrate the proposition that local control represents a better way, a way which has proved to be successful in many places. Why can it not be successful in Connecticut, where we have traditionally prized local initiative and control? Thank you very much.

Rep. Arline Ryan: Mr. chairman, it seems to me that the confusion that is arising, is the fact that there is no definition of a community college, which can be taken (inaudible) throughout the state as a whole. From what you people say in Norwalk and the gentlemen from Manchester said, you have two entirely different approaches to a technical college. In other words, sir, you will never in your community college, unless there is some state system set up, you will never add vocational education to your curricular, right?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: I certainly would never add technical education.

Rep. Arline Ryan: But would you add vocational education?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Certainly --- (inaudible)

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

709

As a matter of fact, medical education is vocational.

Rep. Arline Ryan: To go beyond that. You have no need for it in your particular area. When I'm talking about vocational education I'm talking about a lower level of vocational education. For that reason you'd like state aid, but you don't want the controls that will tell you what you have to do if you get the state aid?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: If I may answer, Mrs. Ryan, we definitely need the state aid to fully do the job. Education is a state function and we are state officers performing that function. Now, if we believe that local management is the best kind of management, that if the best results at the lowest cost per dollar. What we have been told-- we have been told for purposes of accreditation. For example, until they can get approval and obtain a license, we can't even open our doors, or even consider a college. Unless we can get accreditation, we can't keep our doors open. We must face that rigorous control, we live in a glass house, and we know it. We have been providing fine academic standards. I want to disagree with my good friend Fred Lowe, in regard the matter of - (inaudible) in a community college. In my judgement, based on my studies, one of the reasons for drop-outs (is the result of) in the first two years of colleges is the result of huge classes in the freshman and sophomore levels. Sometimes classes running into hundreds of students--(inaudible). We don't have that. Our classes probably number fewer than 25 students per course, and when we need more instructors, we can hire them. Most of these watered down first run requirements, which may, in some institutions begin with the request for ---(Inaudible)

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Excuse me, Mr. Becker, might I ask a question at this point. You had such success in hiring faculty, what is your range in salary?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Our minimum, at the master's level, and we don't want high school teachers teaching in the college. We require, and the Connecticut Council on Higher Education requires of us, that the teachers at our college have a masters degree in (inaudible) -- not in education, and our minimum salary at the masters level is \$5,700., going to almost \$11,000. And I want to say further that absolutely and fully implement our salary schedules. One of the great weaknesses in colleges

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

710

and universities everywhere, most everywhere, is the fact that salary schedules may exist on paper. People are certainly paying minimums, but are they based on incomes, and do they --

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Mr. Becker, who sets your salary schedule?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: The salary schedule is affirmed by the Norwalk Board of Education and in negotiations with the Norwalk Teachers Association.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I see. Don't the Norwalk Community College operate on a day and evening basis, or simply in the evening?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: The Norwalk Community College operates in the afternoon and evening, and we have 400 full time students as well as 400 part time students.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I see. Then are most of the instructors and professors you've employed, people who are also employed in teaching jobs in other institutions?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: About half of the instruction is provided by full time members of the staff, and the other half by part time, and we have one of the highest part time rates of payment of the state.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I see. Now if I could just get your role clear. You are the superintendent of school in Norwalk?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Yes.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: You also the president of--

Dr. Harry A. Becker: I'm the president ex-officio of the college.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: I see. As president ex-officio, do you draw a salary as president?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: No, I do not. No salary.

Rep. Kathleen Tracy: Sir, I have a question. A while back I asked one of the previous members--Do you have a plan for the amount of participation you should have from the state, or just what plan do you have? In order that the students attending your college would pay the same tuition that's paid at the state colleges?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: We think that this could be worked out

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

711

mathematically, without a great deal of problems, I believe representative Padula has introduced one bill which provides payment on an average daily membership basis. This would not be enough, this would result in about a 25% reduction in tuition, but it would be noticeable. It would average about \$125. per student. There are other bills, I believe, Senator Marcus has introduced a bill which would provide for state aid. We are looking hopefully in the direction of some state aid, and if possible state aid that would allow a reduction to about \$200. per student per year.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: This is a hypothetical question, but if legislation similar to the commission's recommendations were to be adopted by the General Assembly, would the Norwalk Community College prefer, do you think, to operate as a private institution with an adequate state support insofar as an increased state scholarship fund, and an ample state loan fund, or would you prefer to go under more control and receive direct subsidies from the state?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Senator Schaffer, I'm not sure I fully understand the question. If your question is this: Let's say that on the basis of local control, we could reduce tuition by \$100. per student per year, but under centralized state control we could reduce tuition by \$300. per student per year, as in that ancient field of (inaudible) law of economics, cheap money drives out good money, and the figure boost in state aid will certainly be guaranteed to drive out local initiative and local interest. We have gone for the maximum dollar help, whether we have to sell our birthright to get it or not. I don't think we're different than other people.

Rep. Philip Doran: Madam chairman? Representative Doran from Berlin. Sir? Your school is in operation for four years now?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Yes, sir.

Rep. Philip Doran: Two classes are graduated?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Yes, sir.

Rep. Philip Doran: Do you have any statistics you could supply us with? Relative to the numbers of successfully transferred to various colleges? Incidentally, we are still interested in your data processing bus-

Rep. Philip Doran, cont'd:

712

iness, your vehicular, those are two different kinds, from a technical. Your placements, too, in the industry, if you have a record of this sort, and how they're doing.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Yes, sir.

Rep. Philip Doran: Would this be possible?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Yes, indeed. We'll be glad to.

Rep. Philip Doran: Thank you.

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: Mr. Becker, I'm sorry to be such a pest, but I really want to try to understand what it is that you're after. In any kind of, whether it be state or federal or even heavy local commitment, in terms of financial support for education, or any other field, there also involves a dual obligation, which is the increased interest of the state, or other elements of government, in the kind of education that you are providing. I assume that your standards are of the highest. I can't get through my mind what it is that you want. Do you want the state to subsidize on a per pupil basis, tuition fees in you community college, at the same time you do not wish to engage in any further kind of direction, insofar as any State Board or any commission of higher education is concerned. Would that be correct? What would you do if this Commission came in and said: We are now going to, we feel that it is essential that we establish a community college in Greenwich, and took part of your pupil pool away from the area of Greenwich. Would you feel that this would be a bad move, because you could service that entire area instead?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Senator Schaffer, let me respond to each question in turn. We do want state financial aid. We are very much aware of state control today, and we have been under rather definite state control from even in the nine months before we were born!

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: But has it been detrimental?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: This kind of state control, we believe, is not detrimental, but this is state control on a policy level, and on accreditation level it is not state control on an operational level. And let me say, when someone says to me all we want is merely budgetary control, I could just laugh, and laugh, and laugh, because he who controls the budget, controls everything. He controls

Dr. Harry A. Becker, cont'd:

713

how much you will pay teachers, he controls whether you will have certain curriculum, he controls how many teachers you will have, in fact, your neck is in the noose. Now, if I may, I'd like to go on to your other question, and that's this: Quite a few years ago, the eminent educator Dr. George Zuk said in the second half of the twentieth century, "Community Colleges will be to the school system, what the high schools became in the first half of the twentieth century". Ladies and gentlemen, I predict that there will be twenty or thirty, or forty community colleges in the state of Connecticut, a state with three million population, and growing, and I would say that we do not seek to preempt the Community College in Greenwich, or anywhere else. It is recognized that in order to have a good community college, you need a certain minimum enrollment, you need certain resources. Someone would be out of his mind to advocate 169 community colleges in the state of Connecticut, but I know there aren't even 169 high schools in the state of Connecticut, for that matter. So that I would judge that if Greenwich wanted a community college, we would be delighted. And we would do everything to help them.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Dr. Becker, a question. It seems that you've probably made the best case for some kind of, at least, cohesive fabric in how we direct these community colleges, because after listening to the discussion, we might have 43, as you predict, or 40. Every one of them might be so different, they might well overlap into teachers colleges, into what U-Conn. is teaching, according to the whims of the board. Now, at the same time, you're also asking for state subsidy. I understand at present we have a bill for \$400,000. for the Norwalk Community College. I also see one thought here that I can't relate, and I would just like to say to you, because I know we can't argue this out. But in all your discussions, and of the three men previous to you, and others, you all seem to indicate that whatever was created in a board, in a higher education commission, plus a board for the community colleges, plus a local board, which is in the bill, from your area, to the advisory board to direct your college, that there's going to be some hostility toward your activities. When actually these people will not be against community colleges, they might lift you to heights you never dreamed of, and here you are opposing something. I think you're fighting tilting your windmills here, and I think your testimony indicates that there is going to

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: cont'd:

714

be some form of control. Now, I think the whole operation may be hung on the nail of how much is left for you. It's a wonderful thing that you feel, but also how much goes to another board? I don't think that you can successfully argue that there must not be some overall plan.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Representative LaGrotta, I'm sorry that my position has been misunderstood, and because of your importance in the matter, I'm particularly sorry that it's been misunderstood by you. Let me go back over it. You see, in order to open a community college, first you need a license. In order to get a license, the State Board of Education must be convinced that you have a population center which will be adequate and which can provide a good college. When we went through this process, believe me it was a very rigorous process. Anyone who imagines that all you do is send a post card to the Board of Education and the license comes by return mail, is very much mistaken. We went through hearings, and interrogation, and investigation, and the submission of plans, and the visitation, and then finally an approval of the report at the level of the committee, which included representatives of the State Department of Education, as well as the Connecticut Council on Higher Education. In some length it had to go to a vote of the State Board. Now, we think that is all as it should be. But this is far from the idea that we can offer whatever we want, or that any institution can offer whatever we want. But, Mr. LaGrotta, when we need more teachers, we can get more teachers, and when we need to pay them, we can pay them, and when we need to advance our curricular, we can do that. Divided we can maintain standards, and we're all for maintaining standards.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: I'd just like to make a statement, if I may. I think that we've rather put the gentleman on the spot with Mr. LaGrotta's statement. I think that same statement could have applied to many people who have appeared here in reference to the public or institutes or others, so I don't want you to go away feeling that you are the one being persecuted.

Dr. Harry Becker: Thank you very much

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Members of the committee, and Mrs. Diefenderfer, Dr. Becker and I have discussed this at much length, and I know he is not startled by my position. We've had the most friendly discussions on

Rep. Guy LaGrotta, cont'd:

715

it, and it's an honest difference of opinion. I just want to bring out both sides of the question.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Absolutely. Mr. LaGrotta is a good friend. I really love you all.

Rep. Arline Ryan: May I say one more thing? I think the gentleman has brought out the weaknesses, and the strength in the commission bill. I think that actually if you have a commission who will control or in any way dictate policy or anything else of community colleges, we have to have a definition of what a community college is. Your interpretation of the community college in Norwalk is completely different from the interpretation of a community college in Manchester, and I think before any one committee can control or have anything to say about the community college, we must first have an interpretation, or definition of a community college.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Senator Schaffer, may I say that I really, really do not think that that is an actual problem, because, in our experience, in working with the State Board of Education, the first question that they have always raised on any submission of a plan, or program, is: Is this really needed, or does it represent duplication? And it has seemed unthinkable to engage in something that represents duplication. I know you want to get rid of my-----

Sen. Gloria Schaffer: No. I understand, we all understand what the steps are that you must take before you are accredited and established, and a standard has to be observed. But I do think that perhaps we, and I'm speaking for the Committee, and you, and the representatives of your community college have two different approaches to this. Now, we in the Legislature are trying to devise many incentives for our private colleges, such as the establishment of a non-taxable loan fund, which would enable private colleges to build dormitories and also classroom facilities at a very nominal cost. We're working on increases in state scholarship programs, and a revolving student loan fund. Now it seems that sooner or later we are going to have to draw a sharper line between what would be the so-called community college as you see it in Norwalk, and what we see as the public community college, and perhaps you might better fit into some of the incentive programs that attempting to about, then to come under some sort of, some type of state support. I mean, you're not willing to

Sen. Gloria Schaffer, cont'd:

716

accept a certain amount of state direction, you can't get state support. We have to guard the tax payer's money and we can't be guided only by what you see as the needs of your community, we must look at the state as a whole.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Thank you Senator. I think you've made your position on it clear, and I believe I indicated what would happen if we would lose money by retaining local initiative.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: As a point of interest, I would like to ask you a question. You mentioned that your teachers were chosen on the basis that they had a masters degree, not necessarily academically, but in the field of discipline, and I'm curious. How does one qualify for a masters degree in discipline, is this through psychological courses or-----

Dr. Harry A. Becker: The discipline I referred to was the academic field. For example, an instructor in biology must have a masters degree in biology, not a masters degree in secondary education. If he's teaching English, it must be in English degree, and again not in secondary education. I meant the academic discipline.

Rep. Eva Diefenderfer: Oh, I see. Thank you.

Rep. Philip Doran: Madam chairman. You spoke of Florida. I'm very interested in how that system works. If you have anything that could be forwarded to study on that?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: I have some of it right here, and I will turn over to the secretary immediately.

Rep. Philip Doran: Is it something like you're proposing? sir?

Dr. Harry A. Becker: We feel it is a very good arrangement which combines state overall coordination and state support, but local operational management.

Rep. Philip Doran: Well, this is perfect.--(Inaudible)-- -----
-----We literally don't know what we're talking about. These people started a school down there and have run it for four years, down in Manchester they haven't even got a graduating class yet. I think we'd be well advised to take a look at some other successful system.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: I don't think representative Doran is speaking for the whole Committee, but his sentiments are good. Would you please answer?

Dr. Harry A. Becker:

717

I don't know that any answer is called for,
Mr. chairman.

The following is a statment on Florida's Community Colleges:

"Pertinent Quotations from "Five Years of Progress - Florida's Community Junior Colleges - Their Contributions and Their Future." A report to the State Board of Education by the State Junior College Advisory Board, 1963.

Florida's community colleges should continue present role as locally controlled institutions providing education at the post high school level as a part of the local public school systems. The statutes and State Board of Education Regulations should be revised wherever needed to provide a clear definition of this role and function.

Historical Development

There were five publicly supported junior colleges in Florida in 1955. These were scattered from Pensacola on the northwest to Palm Beach on the southeast and served an enrollment of 7,200 students in 1957. In the Fall of 1962, there were 29 junior colleges in 17 junior college areas in Florida, serving an enrollment of 38,000 students - more than 500 per cent growth in enrollment in just six years. Future enrollment growth may be just as dramatic. 45,000 students are expected by Fall, 1963, and over 100,000 students by 1970.

In the Fall of 1962, more than 50% of all Florida freshmen enrolled in Florida institutions attended a community college. In the 33 counties supporting junior colleges in 1961, 64% of the Florida freshmen were enrolled in the junior colleges. In a few individual counties, as high as 85% of the Florida freshmen went to the local junior colleges.

Junior Colleges as Different Types of Institutions.

- 1) No junior college may be established without specific and direct approval from the State Board of Education.
- 2) The employment and/or dismissal of the president of a junior college must be approved by the State Board of Education.

- 3) Each junior college has an advisory committee which is appointed by the State Board of Education upon recommendation from the local boards of public instruction. These committees have specific legal functions.
- 4) Each junior college maintains a separate budget which is exempt from all other public school budget approval procedures.
- 5) The junior colleges may not receive free test books.
- 6) The State Board of Education is authorized to provide for specific regulations and supervision of the junior college, apart from grades 1-12.
- 7) A State Junior College Advisory Board makes recommendations to the State Board of Education relative to junior college matters in a manner similar to the local junior college advisory committees and the local school board.

Criteria Used By Florida Task Force in Evaluating Florida Program.

- 1) Local control is desirable and necessary for the survival of a junior college.
- 2) Clear lines and patterns of responsibility and authority are essential and should be centered in a single administrative head.
- 3) Control boards should (a) have reasonable stability in membership (b) have sufficient time to consider junior college matters; and (c) consider issues in relationship to the purposes of the college.
- 4) Provision for adequate and stable financial support must be made.
- 5) Structure for efficient and economical administration must be established.
- 6) Diversity of post high school opportunities must be provided.
- 7) Articulation with other educational agencies and institutions above and below the junior college must be encouraged.
- 8) Provision for statewide coordination must be a part of the plan. "

Dr. Harry A. Becker: Before I'm dismissed, I do have the honor to introduce another speaker. Is that in order?

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: By all means.

Dr. Harry A. Becker: It is my privilege at this point to introduce an educator of national repute. He is a former superintendent of schools in the state of Connecticut, one of my distinguished predecessors in Norwalk, who also served in several other Connecticut cities. He's a past president of the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents. For eleven years he served as a senior specialist in the training of school administrators in the United Office of Education. In this capacity he was engaged in making field studies in various parts of the United States and he worked in practically in every state of the Union. It's my privilege to present Dr. John Lund, now a resident of Norwalk and an active member of our school building committee. Dr. Lund would like the privilege of commenting.

Dr. John Lund: Senator Schaffer and representative LaGrotta, members of the commission I am very happy to have this opportunity to think through with you some aspects of this total program and problem that you've been discussing here today. I hadn't intended to get into this matter of junior colleges and its relationship to the state which Dr. Becker presented and having in mind the reaction here, perhaps I can cast a little oil on the water, because, after all, the thing that makes American education on the face of the globe most unique, and solely unique, actually, is our invocation of this principle of local control. We've turned over to the cities and towns of America, the boards of education and school committees full control of their operation under certain state policies and recommendations and having in mind the aid which the state provides, as we do in Connecticut, for example, for new buildings, and we've received a good deal of state aid in the last decade in Norwalk for aid for the building of schools. I'm sure that the kind of control that the State Board of Education has exerted and it has controls of many things, and the many things they require for a local board to do. Some of it even relates to operation under some phases. There's no real problem here, division of control between a local board or a local community college, as I see it, and the state authorities. We certainly can work together, as we have in the past in our public schools systems through the high

Dr. John Lund, cont'd:

720

schools, and now apparently the community college is going to move up our whole purview of education at the local level. Until we can reach that fine(state) stage of development they've already reached in some states, notably California, where every child in California is within commuting distance of a well established and well operating junior college. The thing that I'd like to speak about briefly at this time, relates to an entirely aspect of our problem. I read the study of your Study Commission, and I've followed this whole matter with a great deal of interest. There's one thing that disturbs me. Speaking now as an administrator, and as one who has been rather familiar with administrative operations throughout the nation, and that is that the recommendations for this multiplicity of boards and agencies at the federal level, which I would call proliferation of agencies dealing with various aspects of what we call higher education. Well, higher education begins, presumably at the high school level, but this proliferation, and then it's attendant fragmentation, where you have various boards and groups dealing with specific aspects of education. I'm firmly convinced that under that kind of a system you're going to discover that the key words which are used everywhere in education today(are coordination,) is basic in most of our problems, are coordination, and articulation. You're going to find is increasingly difficult, it seems to me, to operate under such a complex set-up of state organizations, or agencies. As a matter of fact, the way the thing stands now, the title of your sole state agency, the State Board of Education is a misnomer, because this eliminates them as a state board of education. It limits them to a small fraction of the whole educational process. And I'd just like to put in my word as a word of warning, and an invitation, at least, to reconsider very carefully, very carefully all of the implications that are involved in this organization of bettors that you recommended, I can agree with everything that has been said here today with respect to the objectives, which we all share in the development of higher education. But let's not encumber ourselves, with machinery that may make it difficult to coordinate, and to articulate between the various levels of educational operation of the state. And that, my friends, is essentially what felt strongly as I sat here today, listening to this most interesting discussions. I've been greatly impressed with the work that your Commission has done, but let's not make mistakes that we'll ultimately be

Dr. John Lund, cont'd:

721

sorry for. Let us study more the implications of some of these proposals within this overall bill for the development of higher education in Connecticut. I shall watch with great interest how we develop it. I'm very proud, of course, of what is being done in Norwalk, which I know so well. My experience in the whole field of educational administration, and I've worked at the university level, I've been visiting professor at four major institutions, Yale, New York University, University of Illinois, and for two summers, the Claremont Graduate School in California. These problems have been discussed over the years, and yet I know no state in the Union, that has an organization set-up at the state level as prolific in the number of agencies, and so (fragmentated with) segmentated with responsibility of each of these agencies. Thank you very much.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Any one else representing Norwalk?

Mrs. Katherine Bourne: Not only do I have a difference of opinion with Dr. Becker, there's a certain difference in height! You mentioned Manchester before and I did not want to appear for the Board of Education because I believe that all of you received the letter from the, from our superintendent giving you a copy of the resolution which the Board voted upon. Basically I just want to reiterate about Manchester that we feel that we do not fear state control in this area, rather looking forward to a better education for all of the students of the state, that we feel that this would be necessary. Now I wonder if it would be proper for me to read somebody else's statement? Is that all right? Well, this is a young man who gave it to me because I was talking with him in the hall, and I want to explain that he was the president of the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce, because if I start off by saying that I represent some 3600 young men in 81 cities and towns, it may sound anomalous, but he left the statement. His name is Joseph P. McGuinness.

Statement by Joseph P. McGuinness--read by Mrs. Bourne:

Our Board of Directors have passed a motion to support Community Colleges and presently we have an active committee working in this area. It is the feel of our organization that:

- 1) The majority of our members have small children and we are deeply concerned with their educational future and the future of

Mr. Joseph P. McGuinness statement: cont'd:

722

all children in our state.

- 2) Recognizing the present demands on our State Higher Education facilities and the fact that many youngsters who would like to attend college cannot be admitted because of the lack of room, we strongly endorse the need for community colleges throughout our state. However, we do not want them to be considered as an earlier speaker mentioned as the expansion of this educational need to be merely 14 grades which would imply they would be no more than a Senior High School. They must be accorded the dignity and status of Community Colleges. They must have a purpose other than just to spend time. They should train young men and women to do a better job in life for themselves and their children.
- 3) With the present population of people between 21 and 35 at 38% of our population and with this figure expected to be 50% by 1970, unless we have community colleges we will not be able to satisfy the ever increasing demands and desires for a better education.
- 4) Since at the present time, the University of Connecticut is unable to take in all the accredited students applying, there is a definite need for other facilities. Should the decision be left as currently with the present State Board of Education, there is the possibility that should it be decided to set up a branch of the University that there would be no college at all.
- 5) HB 4719 would set up a system that would give higher education a more prominent place. It would give direction in the proper setting up of community colleges as to curriculum and where they should be located for the maximum effectiveness. Without this direction we might have a chaotic situation of colleges just springing up without any regard for need. It would also have the interest of working for funds to make sure these needed colleges are established.
- 6) Where established colleges have not satisfied the demands such as in California, community colleges have been an effective means of helping many youngsters to get a

Mr. Joseph P. McGuinness statement, cont'd:

723

higher education.

- 7) We spend a great deal of money for many things that have much less an effect on the future of our state than the education of our young people.

We urge this committee to act favorably on HB 4719 to give the maximum number of our youngsters the chance to gain a higher education.

Mr. Frank Brennon: On behalf of the School Board Members Louis Arsenalt, Ferdinand Laudisi and Ellsworth Somers, of the Waterbury School Board, I wish to affirm our support for the proposed State System of Higher Education. We believe this legislation is an effective beginning in placing stronger emphasis on higher education. Consequently we will expect it to expedite the broadening of advance educational offerings throughout the state. But because this is only the beginning, we must temper our enthusiasm until the high motives of these proposals are translated into genuine realities of legitimate value. Local interest in Waterbury for higher education has been greatly accelerated since the issuance of the Commissions study. Because of this wide spread interest we would be less frank if we did not itemize what must be expected in Waterbury from these bills.

- 1) The immediate organization of a two year community college to act as a complement to the Waterbury Technical Institute. Such an institution is already being studied and a local committee is at the disposal of any and all interested persons.
- 2) The immediate re-organization of present under-graduate facilities for the purpose of providing a 4 year Bachelors Program.
- 3) The recognition of Waterbury as the leading community in Western Connecticut. This must result in the utilization of our capable citizens on the various boards and committees which will be created by this legislation. The very de-centralized nature of these bills demand that this be done.

The Activities generated by this new awareness in scholastic excellence will not be viewed in a

Mr. Frank Brennon, cont'd:

724

calm and convenient manner by our city. On the contrary, we will keenly scrutinize all efforts. We wait with restrained excitement for the successful passage of the legislation; we yearn for the opportunity to assist in its implementation.

Rep. Guy LaGrotta: Anyone else care to speak to this bill? I would like to ask the members of the Committee to remain for just a minute. We have an announcement we'd like to make to them. If not I declare the hearing closed. Thank you for your patience.