BOR ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Thursday, October 7, 2021 at 9:30 a.m.
Conducted via Remote Participation
Meeting will live stream at: https://youtu.be/VRxpuTBpWjl

1. Approval of Minutes
   a. September 10, 2021 – Page 1

2. Action Items
   a. CSCU Centers and Institutes
      i. Center for Connecticut Studies – Renewal – Eastern CT State University – Page 13

   b. Revised Mission Statement: Eastern CT State University – Page 39

   c. CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force: Final Report and Recommendations – Dr. Tuesday Cooper, Co-Chair, and, Dr. William Lugo, Co-Chair, CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force – Page 43

   d. BOR Policy: Student Athlete’s Name, Image, and Likeness – Angelo Simoni, Senior Executive Director; Compliance, Equity & Student Relations – Page 83

   e. BOR Policy: Selection of a Single Office of Postsecondary Education Identification Number for CT State Community College – Dr. Alison Buckley, VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, and, Steven McDowell, AVP Financial Aid Services and Title IV – Page 88

3. Informational Items
   a. Update on Implementation of the ACME Policy – CT State Community College

   b. CSCU Accessibility Policy Update – Kevin Corcoran, Executive Director of Digital Learning – Page 91

If any member of the public is unable to attend the meeting in real-time due to a lack of physical location or electronic equipment, they may request assistance by email to PHeleen@commnet.edu at least 24 hours before the meeting.
The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Chair Merle Harris.

An official roll call of the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee members was taken and the responses were as follows:

- Chair Merle Harris – Present
- Regent Aviva Budd – Present
- Regent Holly Howery – Present
- Regent Colena Sesanker (ex officio) – Present

A quorum was declared.

Chair Merle Harris announced some membership changes on the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Regent Naomi Cohen’s term has expired. Governor Lamont appointed Richard Porth to serve on the Board of Regents. Regent Porth will be a member of the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee and will attend his first meeting of the Committee in October.

Chair Harris welcomed the participants to the start of the new Academic Year 2021-2022 and stated that the BOR appreciates the efforts and hard work of all faculty, staff, and students in these challenging times.
1. Approval of Minutes  
   a. June 11, 2021  
   On a motion by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd, a vote was taken and the minutes from the June 11, 2021, BOR ASA Committee meeting were approved unanimously.

2. Consent Items  
   a. Discontinuations  
      i. Social Sciences – BS – Central CT State University  
      ii. Education – MS – Southern CT State University  
      iii. Earth and Planetary Sciences – MA – Western CT State University  
      iv. English – MA – Western CT State University  
      vi. Digital Arts Technology-Multimedia/Web Authoring - AA – Naugatuck Valley Community College  
      vii. Digital Arts Technology-Graphics/Animation - AA – Naugatuck Valley Community College  
      viii. Digital Arts Technology-Audio/Video Option - AA – Naugatuck Valley Community College  

   b. Correction of Degree Title – Digital Media Production – Middlesex CC – Modification - Board Resolution – BR 21-079 FROM: Associate of Science (AS), TO: Associate of Applied Science (AAS)  

   c. Correction of Program Name – Gateway CC – New Program - Board Resolution – BR 21-054 FROM: Business Management: Sport Management Option, TO: Business Administration: Sport Management Option  

   On a motion by A. Budd and seconded by H. Howery a vote was taken, and the consent items were approved unanimously.

3. Action Items  
   a. Modifications  
      i. Counselor Education – MS – Western CT State University [Change in Modality]  
         Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the modification to the Western CT State University Master of Science in Counselor Education, namely the change from an on-ground instructional modality to a hybrid instructional modality. The motion was moved by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd.  
         Provost Missy Alexander, Dr. Joan Palladino, Interim Dean, School of Professional Studies, Dr. Nicole DeRonck, Associate Professor and Coordinator, MS Counselor Education Program, presented the program modification, which is a change in instructional modality, from on-ground to hybrid. As a result of this change in modality, the MS in Counselor Education will be the only hybrid graduate program in counseling in the CSCU system. The modality change was made because of the pandemic and the change will allow students to manage their diverse responsibilities at home and at school.  
         Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the motion and the vote was unanimous.
ii. Graphics and Animation – C2 Certificate - Naugatuck Valley Community College
   [Name Change]
Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the modification of the Naugatuck Valley Community College Graphics and Animation C2 Certificate, specifically a name change to “Digital Graphics for Print and Screen”. The motion was moved by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd.

iii. Multimedia/Web Authoring – C2 Certificate - Naugatuck Valley Community College
   [Name Change]
Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the modification of the Naugatuck Valley Community College Multimedia/Web Authoring C2 Certificate, specifically a name change to “Emerging Media”. The motion was moved by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd.

The two programs were presented by Dr. H. Justin Moore, Interim Dean of Academic Affairs, Professor Ray Leite, Program Coordinator Digital Arts Technology, and Brad Baker, Associate Dean of the Liberal Arts and Behavioral and Social Sciences (LABSS) Division. The modifications to these two programs and the program discontinuations in Section 2.a. relate to the overall revision of the Digital Arts Technology program at NVCC. The modifications will provide students with a more flexible format and an easier transition to a career in the Digital Arts or a transfer to a graduate program. As a result of a thorough review of the Digital Arts program, NVCC eliminated program options within the AS program and created a single parent program with new certificates to coincide with the discontinued program options in Section 2.a. This program revision allows students to specialize rather than completing multiple degree options under the AS degree. The certificates are stackable.

Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the motion to modify the Naugatuck Valley Community College Graphics and Animation C2 Certificate, specifically a name change to “Digital Graphics for Print and Screen”, and the vote was unanimous.

Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the motion to modify the Naugatuck Valley Community College Multimedia/Web Authoring C2 Certificate, specifically a name change to “Emerging Media”, and the vote was unanimous.

b. New Programs
i. Animation and Motion Graphics - C2 Certificate - Naugatuck Valley Community College
Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the licensure of a program in Animation and Motion Graphics leading to a C2 Certificate at Naugatuck Valley Community College; and grant its accreditation for a period of seven semesters beginning with its initiation, such initiation to be determined in compliance with BOR guidelines for new programs approved on or after April 3, 2020. The motion was moved by A. Budd and seconded by H. Howery.

This new C2 Certificate in Animation and Motion Graphics replaces the discontinued certificate options in Section 2.a. and gives students a stackable credential under the Digital Arts Technology parent program.
Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the new Naugatuck Valley Community College Animation and Motion Graphics C2 Certificate and the vote was unanimous.

ii. **Business Intelligence – AS – Northwestern CT Community College**

Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the licensure of a program in Business Intelligence leading to an Associate of Science at Northwestern Connecticut Community College; and grant its accreditation for a period of seven semesters beginning with its initiation, such initiation to be determined in compliance with BOR guidelines for new programs approved on or after April 3, 2020. The motion was moved by A. Budd and seconded by H. Howery.

Dr. Jay Whitaker, Interim Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, and, Professor Stacey Williams, Business, presented this new program, the first of its kind in the CT Community Colleges. It’s an innovative and rare program at the Associate of Science level. It combines traditional business theory with innovative data technology to create critical thinkers and well-rounded business professionals. The positions for which graduates with an AS in Business Intelligence can qualify are business analysts which are in short supply especially in the insurance industry in CT.

**Questions/Recommendations from the Committee included:**

- **a)** *To which BS degree does the AS in Business Intelligence transfer?* Response: The BS in Management Information Systems (MIS).

- **b)** *Is the BS in MIS an IT or a Business degree?* Response: It can be both.

- **c)** *Would an AS be sufficient for graduates to get business analysis jobs?* Response: Yes. *Is this because companies pay less for an AS degree than a BS degree?* Response: There aren’t enough qualified people for data analyst jobs. **Chair Harris noted that graduates should be encouraged to go on for a BS degree.** Right now, there’s a shortage; but, eventually, there could be an oversupply of applicants to jobs. Response: Professor Williams noted that some companies will hire candidates with AS degrees; but they will eventually have to get a BS degree. Many companies will help students financially to get their BS degrees.

- **d)** *Is this a hybrid degree? Is it the institution’s intention to continue the online course after COVID?* Response: Yes. This is a hybrid degree and it is NCCC’s intention to continue online courses after the pandemic.

Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the new Northwestern CT Community College AS in Business Intelligence and the vote was unanimous.

iii. **REVISED – Bachelor of General Studies – BGS – Central CT State University**

Chair Harris provided background on the revised new BGS program proposed by Central CT State University (CCSU). Chair Harris stated that CCSU presented the proposal for their new BGS program at the June 11, 2021 meeting of the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee. At that meeting, the Committee tabled the motion for the proposed new BGS program at CCSU. The Committee requested that CCSU work with Charter Oak State College (COSC), Connecticut’s online institution, on its BGS program. CCSU and COSC created a partnership agreement (See below) on the BGS program.

The Resolution for the action was changed to include the terms of the partnership agreement between CCSU and COSC. CCSU must work within that partnership agreement.
Chair Harris read the substitute motion:

That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure of a program in General Studies leading to a Bachelor of General Studies at Central Connecticut State University, and grant its accreditation for a period of seven semesters beginning with its initiation, such initiation to be determined in compliance with BOR guidelines for new programs approved on or after April 3, 2020. This approval includes the accompanying Partnership Agreement with Charter Oak State College which may lead to some students completing and being awarded the degree at Charter Oak; the application for continued licensure and accreditation to be submitted in the seventh semester of the program will include information on the partnership.

The motion was moved by A. Budd and seconded by H. Howery.

**Central Connecticut State University**

**Charter Oak State College**

This Agreement, hereinafter called “Agreement,” is made by and between Central Connecticut State University, hereinafter called “CCSU,” and the Charter Oak State College, hereinafter called “Charter Oak”, to clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of each party as they relate to the coordinated efforts to support the articulated collaborative between the two institutions known as “Bachelor’s of General Studies” or “BGS”.

**I. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND PARTNERSHIP GOALS**

1. CCSU wishes to offer a Bachelor’s of General Studies to help bring back students who have stopped out to complete their degree.
2. CCSU students who have obtained at least 75 credits, are in good academic standing, and have been stopped out for approximately 1-3 years will be contacted (phone, email, text) to see if they would be interested in expediting their path toward degree completion by obtaining a Bachelor’s in General Studies.
3. The goal is to create a scenario that is a win-win for CCSU and Charter Oak, but ultimately for the students. The focus is to obtain more completers from those students who are close to graduation (defined as 75 credits or more completed).

**II. CCSU RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS AGREEMENT**

CCSU shall:

1. Develop a system to identify and re-admit students who would like to complete their degree on-ground.
2. Determine if students have significant work or life experience and refer to Charter Oak to examine and award PLA credits, as appropriate to help complete their degree.
3. Determine pre-approval process to ensure credits completed at Charter Oak would be transferred back to CCSU and applied to the degree.
4. Provide a dedicated program liaison to coordinate the Bachelor’s of General Studies.
5. Provide a dedicated academic advisor to participating CCSU students.

III. CHARTER OAK’S RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS AGREEMENT

Charter Oak shall:

1. Develop an application to admit students who would like to complete their degree online.
2. Waive applications fees for the CCSU Bachelor’s of General Studies initiative.
3. Develop criteria to identify students as either a visiting student (who are taking online classes to transfer back to CCSU) or as part of Charter Oak’s General Studies degree based on credits completed at the time of outreach and if completing degree on-ground or online.
4. Determine if students participating in the BGS program for both CCSU and Charter Oak have significant work or life experience and if the experience can be used for PLA credits to help complete their degree.
5. Provide a dedicated program liaison to coordinate the Bachelor’s of General Studies.
6. Provide a dedicated academic advisor to participating students.

IV. MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS AGREEMENT:

The parties shall collaborate to:

1. Create an objective selection process to identify and retain students for participation in the Bachelor’s of General Studies.
2. Identify CCSU students who have obtained at least 75 credits, are in good academic standing, and have been stopped out for approximately 1-3 years.
3. Coordinate outreach efforts to contact eligible students to see if they would be interested in expediting their path to completion by obtaining a Bachelor’s in General Studies.
4. Develop an application and admission process for students who want to complete their degree both on-ground and online so that they may attend both CCSU and Charter Oak. Charter Oak will waive the application fee and allow students to attend as visiting students. CCSU will grant the student a CCSU General Studies Degree upon completion.
5. Create a yearly summary to be distributed to CCSU, Charter Oak, and the BOR.

The program was presented by Dr. Kimberly Kostelis, Interim Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Marianne Fallon, AVP for Academic Affairs, Planning and Resources, Dr. Beth Merenstein, Professor, Sociology, and Dr. David Ferreira, Provost, Charter Oak State College. The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) degree is a pathway to degree completion for a variety of students including incoming transfer students, adult learners, students stalled in a professional program, and/or veterans who have accumulated credits at other institutions. The agreement between CCSU and COSC provides increased flexibility and options for students to complete the BGS degree at either CCSU or COSC.
Questions/Recommendations from the Committee included:
a) Is there a requirement to complete on-ground course work at CCSU? Is a student required to complete 75 credits to qualify for the BGS program? Response: A student must have completed 75 credits to complete the BGS at or take online courses towards the BGS degree at COSC. Students can complete the BGS on ground at CCSU or take some online classes towards the BGS degree at COSC and transfer them back to CCSU. The goal is to remove barriers for the students and give them the flexibility to complete their BGS degrees.
b) Is the degree from COSC a BGS or a BA? Response: Students can attain the BGS degree at COSC or another baccalaureate degree in Health Care or Business, for example. BGS students can shift into a traditional bachelor’s degree program at COSC.
c) Is a traditional BS/BA degree more desirable than a BGS degree in the workplace? Is there specific data on the usefulness of a BGS degree? What is the career path for a student who graduates with a BGS degree vs. a specialized BS/BA degree? Response: There are no specific jobs for a candidate with a BGS degree vs. other bachelor’s degrees. The benefit of a BGS degree, according to CCSU’s graduates, are they can advance in their current jobs. They are held back from promotion by not having a bachelor’s degree in any discipline. Though the BGS is not a specialized degree, it does lead to career advancement for graduates. Do students understand this when they enter the BGS program, that the BGS is not a traditional degree leading to a career path?

Chair Harris reiterated that the BGS degree is important for students who are already employed and can’t advance without a bachelor’s degree. People who have stopped out of a traditional bachelor’s program and complete a BGS degree for career advancement often go on to attain an MA or MS degree. Provost Ferreira stated that students in the military must have a bachelor’s degree to become an officer. The bachelor’s degree can be a BGS or in any discipline.
Advising will be a key part of the conversation with students who are in the BGS program or are interested in a traditional bachelor’s program. Chair Harris noted that the partnership between CCSU and COSC is a good example of how CSCU colleges and universities can work together.

Chair Harris called for a vote on the substitute motion to approve the new CCSU Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) degree which includes the accompanying Partnership Agreement with Charter Oak State College. A vote was taken and the vote was unanimous.

d. CSCU Centers and Institutes
   i. Center for Teaching and Learning – Southern CT State University [New Center]
   Item 3.d. was presented/discussed before Item 3.c.
   Chair Harris called for a motion to establish the Center for Teaching and Learning at Southern Connecticut State University until December 31, 2028, with an interim progress report to be provided by September 1, 2025. The motion was moved by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd.
   Provost Robert Prezant, Dr. Stephen Hegedus, Dean, College of Education, and, Dr. Kari Sassu, Center of Excellence on Autism Spectrum Disorders, presented the proposed new Center. SCSU is proposing a Center that combines recent strategic hiring and
programmatic initiatives in the College of Education, with faculty from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Health and Human Services, and the School of Business, as well as with collaborators across the SCSU campus. The Center will support educational innovation through research, professional development and policy study work and will collaborate with local school districts, state agencies, industry, national and international institutions. Locally, the Center will support and enhance the pedagogical skills of teaching faculty at SCSU through workshops and seminars committed to diversity and inclusion and best practice.

Dr. Gates mentioned a letter, which is attached to these minutes, from the State Board of Education Commissioner, Dr. Charlene M. Russell-Tucker. The letter strongly supports the proposed new Center for Teaching and Learning at Southern CT State University.

Dr. Hegedus read and elaborated on the Four Pillars of Work from the graphic included in the documentation for the proposed new Center:

1. Improving Teaching and Learning
2. Conducting Research and Innovation
3. Developing Multidisciplinary Communities
4. Creating Innovative Spaces

Questions/Recommendations from the Committee included:

a) The budget expenditures for 2024-2025 increase materially and then the Center runs at a deficit based on the projection of revenue. Response: Years 1-3 are the start-up years. In years 3-4, we will hire a Center Manager. The Center will not run at a deficit in 2024-2025, it will be self-sustaining.

b) The proposed SCSU Center for Teaching and Learning will add value to the entire CSCU system. The work you are doing to improve teaching at SCSU could extend to other campuses. Have you thought about this? Response: One example that is already in motion is in the initiative to affect change due to inequities in the Early Childhood space. We are partnering with all the CSUs and many of the community colleges. We are collaborating with other institutions to unpack and revise state regulations.

c) The proposal for the Center has a section on Global Education Services. Can you elaborate on what services are provided globally? Response: One example is that we worked with 6-7 countries to translate material on autism spectrum disorders into other languages to make them accessible to educators in those countries. Another example is that a team from SCSU visited the UN to present work to ambassadors from Sub-Saharan countries.

Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the establishment of the Center for Teaching and Learning at Southern Connecticut State University and the vote was unanimous.

c. BOR Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process Amendment

Chair Harris called for a motion to approve the revised Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process. The motion was moved by A. Budd and seconded by H. Howery.

Dr. Ken Klucznik, VP of Academic Affairs, presented. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs is requesting a modification to the Academic Program Low Completer Process to reflect the current practice of the submission of Academic Program Review (APR) Form 2 Low Completers by each institution. The ASA Office aggregates the institutional Low
Completer Reports into a single Low Completer Report Summary and submits it to the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee and the BOR. Originally, all institutions scanned all their programs to produce the APR report. Since then, the submission of the reports follows the APR sequence. What was not in the original policy was the process of submitting the Low Completer Report. The report that was submitted to the ASA Committee by the ASA Office was an aggregation of the institutional Low Completer Reports submitted in the institutions’ annual Academic Program Review Reporting. This is a technical change to ensure that the Low Completer Process reflects the actual practice.

Questions/Recommendations from the Committee included:

i. **The problem is that there is not enough detail regarding low completer programs that the institution decides to continue and not terminate. Will this process revision address this problem?**

   Response: No. This policy revision will not address this problem. We will have to talk with the ASAC Committee to understand what kind of detail is necessary for low completer programs that are continued and not discontinued. **We need to see the details about why an institution decides to continue a low completer program. Then, the Committee can ask for more information if necessary. We need the details regarding the decision to continue the program sooner than the next review.**

Dr. Klucznik stated that the Low Completer Report is only submitted with the APR every seven years. The form itself can be made clearer. For each of the four choices, the institution will be required to include sufficient detail to support the choice and why it was made. Provost Gates stated that she supports the modification of the form. Chair Harris stated that a revised form will be helpful, then Committee members can ask for more information.

**Chair Harris called for a vote to approve the revised Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process. A vote was taken and it was unanimous.**

Chair Harris thanked Provost Gates and Dr. Ken Klucznik for their service to CSCU over the last six months. Dr. Gates served as both Interim CSCU President and in her current role as Provost and SVP of Academic and Student Affairs. Dr. Klucznik assumed many of the responsibilities of the role of Provost of Academic and Student Affairs.

4. **Informational Items/Other Business**
   a. **Below Threshold**
      i. Accelerated Accounting Pathway – Concentration - BS to MS Accounting – Central CT State University [New Academic Offering]
      ii. Accelerated Accounting Pathway – Concentration - BS to MBA Accounting – Central CT State University [New Academic Offering]
      iii. Accelerated Finance Pathway – Concentration - BS Finance to MBA – Central CT State University [New Academic Offering]
      iv. Healthcare Administration – Graduate Certificate – Southern CT State University [New Academic Offering]
      v. Digital Arts Technology – AS – Naugatuck Valley Community College [Program Modification]
b. **CSCU Online Programs Update – Kevin Corcoran, Executive Director, Digital Learning**

Director Corcoran presented an update on CSCU Online Programs discussing broad considerations regarding online programs specifically at the undergraduate level. He began by discussing concerns expressed by the CSCU institutions, primarily at the undergraduate level, regarding providing all required Gen Ed. and all necessary electives in an online model. Other concerns included whether institutions have experienced faculty who can teach in an online modality and the necessary services and support for students and if the expansion of online courses will negatively impact on-ground courses.

Director Corcoran discussed possible approaches used by other state systems. These included: restrictive offerings, seat/course exchange, prioritized seating for fully online students, a centralized catalogue of online courses across the system, and the use of consortial agreements among institutions.

Director Corcoran discussed key considerations when developing online programming. Among these are quality assurance, regulatory issues at all governmental levels, faculty/student supports, making logistics and transferability seamless for students, fair revenue sharing, and reporting/tracking.

The CSCU Online Learning Council was charged by Provost Gates and is accepting applications for membership. The first meeting of the Council will take place in November, and it will report to and make recommendations to the CSCU Academic Council. Regent Howery will serve on the CSCU Online Learning Council and will be a link between the Council and the ASAC.

Chair Harris stated that CT is behind other states in online learning. She expressed the need to develop an approach that works for CT and that expands our online offerings. The CSCU Online Learning Council will be a big step in helping that to happen.

c. **BOR Policy: Recognition and Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs, Pam Heleen, Associate Director of Board Affairs**

This revised policy will go to the BOR Finance Committee before being presented to the BOR. Director Heleen is presenting the revised policy to the BOR ASAC today to solicit comments. This project was under way in October 2019 under review by the Naming Policy Review Workgroup which has not met since 2019. The Community College policy is 15 years old and the CSU policy is 12 years old. The new policy streamlines the former policy and provides flexibility and ownership for donor development under the CSUs, Regional Presidents and Campus CEOs.

Director Heleen noted that there is a 30-day review period before the full October BOR Meeting. The policy will include a timeline for procedural development.

**Questions/Recommendations from the Committee included:**

1. *In the “Regent Recognition” Section, if we want to bestow an honorary degree on a regent, does this request come from CSCU or do we have to go through the campus process? Would this request override campus policy?* Response: No, it would be in addition to. It is at the discretion of the BOR. I will make sure the policy is specific on this issue.

2. *Generally, we name buildings/centers because of a large monetary donation. This policy doesn’t give any priority to that. How do we encourage monetary donations to happen more frequently?* Response: The intent is that in the campus donor development strategic plan, campuses will have identified and developed potential donors. *We should honor people who have done a lot for the institution; but there’s*
also a need for money. Building naming allows for the setup of endowed funds. Response: Are we opting for non-monetary recognition in lieu of another donor or taking a donor off the table for future donations? We must be careful about naming opportunities without financial contributions. This is traditionally how we get large endowments. Response: We will make sure that the “Non-Financial Donor Recognition” section will include this.

d. Emeriti
   i. SCSU

On a motion by H. Howery and seconded by A. Budd, the Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting of the September 10, 2021, BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee at 10:52 a.m.
Good morning Chair Harris and members of the Academic Affairs Committee.

On behalf of the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), it gives me great pleasure to acknowledge the work of the College of Education at Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) in the establishment of the Center for Teaching and Learning.

SCSU has been a leader in educator preparation for over 125 years, and is one of the largest producers of educators within the state.

The Center for Teaching and Learning is an example of SCSU’s visionary work which seeks to focus on improving the work of higher education and its direct impact on school improvement and learners’ achievements in Connecticut. This has been and remains a goal of the CT State Board of Education and the CSDE.

As outlined, the Center will work with local school districts, state agencies, industry and national institutions to accomplish the following:

- Improve teaching and learning;
- Conduct research and innovation in the Art and Science of Teaching;
- Develop multidisciplinary communities of educators; and
- Create incubation clinics, offices and develop new initiatives.

The work of the center will provide a robust body of research and professional development that can be utilized by educators to enhance the efforts of the larger educational community in Connecticut and beyond.

Again, the CSDE applauds your vision and implementation of a resource which will benefit educators, students, families and all those who seek to improve the quality of education in the State of Connecticut for years to come.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene Russell-Tucker
Commissioner-Designate
CT State Department of Education
RESOLUTION

concerning

Renewal of a Center

October 21, 2021

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the continuation of the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University until December 31, 2028.

A True Copy:

____________________________________
Alice Pritchard, Secretary of the
CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
ITEM
Continuation of the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University until December 31, 2028.

BACKGROUND
The David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University was established on November 14, 1986 and was reauthorized for continuation on October 8, 2009 until December 31, 2014 by the CSU Board of Trustees. On October 16, 2014, the Board of Regents reauthorized the Center until December 31, 2021. The BOR CSCU Establishment of Centers and Institutions policy requires each center or institute to be reviewed in its seventh year of authorization. At that time, campus presidents review this report and may then forward a recommendation for continuation. Thereafter, every seven years, each center or institute goes through review and possible renewal.

President Elsa M. Nunez has recommended that authorization for the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies be continued for another seven years, until December 31, 2028.

RATIONALE
The mission of the David Morris Roth for Connecticut Studies is to foster quality instruction and research on the state’s history, culture, and genealogy, with a focus on Windham, Tolland, and New London counties. The Center collects, preserves, and make accessible primary and secondary materials on the state’s history, and supports learning and dissemination of historical information through collaboration with Eastern’s academic departments, Digital History Lab, and local museums and community members.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT
The need for the Center not only continues but keeps growing. Students are increasingly attracted to the public history field, and the Center offers an opportunity for hands on experiences within the campus setting. It also serves as a resource for future social studies teachers, since the State of Connecticut currently recommends the CT Social Studies Frameworks to be included in curriculum for K-12, and proposed legislation for social studies education includes for example a bill to mandate Native American history, with special focus on the Eastern Woodlands people.

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES/ACCOMPLISHMENTS
The Center’s resources continue to be heavily used by community members for a number of research topics. Examples of resources maintained and available at the Center follow.

The Center has acquired a number of archival collections, including:

- The Charles Fenton Collection includes personal papers and records from the time of service of Charles Fenton, a member of the 21st Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers during the American Civil War.
• The Stanley R. Kokoska Collection offers information about Stanley R. Kokoska, mayor of Willimantic Connecticut from 1967-1969 and an active community member.
• The Brothertown Indian Nation Collection, 1800-1920, includes substantial materials related to a Native American Community established by a group of Christian Indians from southern New England and Long Island, N.Y.

The Center also maintains past issues of *The Chronicle*, a newspaper established in 1877 and covering news from Windham, Tolland, and New London counties. This resource has been and continues to be invaluable for a number of publications on the history of the region.

**STUDENT/FACULTY/COMMUNITY IMPACT**

The staff at the Center make presentations to classes of students by request of the teaching faculty. History majors often use the Center’s resources for research. Several student papers completed with research materials from the Center have been published and have been presented at conferences. Work study and history students are regularly involved in archival work.

Faculty as well as local historians make use of the Center for research that has led to a number of publications in recent years.

**BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$27,263</td>
<td>$29,668</td>
<td>$6,981</td>
<td>$14,059</td>
<td>$32,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$26,963</td>
<td>$29,368</td>
<td>$6,681</td>
<td>$13,759</td>
<td>$31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues Less Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$27,671</td>
<td>$30,455</td>
<td>$30,855</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$27,371</td>
<td>$30,155</td>
<td>$30,555</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues Less Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Center is fully funded by the institution – personnel costs are primarily for the salary and fringe benefits for the Director and salaries for student employees. Grant funds support the Center’s special projects.
RECOMMENDATION
It is the recommendation of the System’s Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs to approve this continuation.
Name of University: Eastern Connecticut State University
Name of Center/Institute: David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies
Director/Coordinator: Anna Kirchmann & Jamel Ostwald, Professors of History
Date of Original Approval: 1986 by David M. Roth
Date of Last Approval: October 2, 2014
Board Resolution of Last Approval: October 16, 2014
Sunset Date: December 31, 2021

Recommendation from President:

I have reviewed the attached report and the following is my recommendation to the Board of Regents:

☐ I recommend continuation of this Center/Institute ☐

I recommend discontinuation of this Center/Institute

Signature of President

Comments (OPTIONAL):
**Mission:**
The mission of David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies is to foster quality instruction and research on the state’s history, culture, and genealogy, with a focus on Windham, Tolland, and New London counties. The Center’s non-circulating collection includes primary and secondary materials on all aspects of the state’s development. A program of seminars, conferences, plays, public lectures and workshops promotes the Center’s collection and activities.

**Revised Mission Statement:**
The mission of David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies is to foster quality instruction and research on the state’s history, culture, and genealogy, with a focus on Windham, Tolland, and New London counties. The Center collects, preserves, and makes accessible primary and secondary materials on the state’s history, and supports learning and dissemination of historical information through collaboration with Eastern’s academic departments, Digital History Lab, and local museums and community members.

**Needs Assessment:**
The David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University was established November 14, 1986 (BR 86-167) and was last re-authorized for continuation in October 2, 2014 until December 31, 2021. The Center was established by David Morris Roth, professor of history from 1962 to 1986. It was initially authorized by a resolution of the CSU Board of Trustees in November 1986, renaming the Center in his honor. The Center was formally dedicated in May 1987. Barbara Tucker, a professor of history in the Department of History at Eastern Connecticut State University, served as the Center’s director until her retirement in 2020.

**Needs Modification:**
The need for the Center not only continues but keeps growing. Students are increasingly attracted to the public history field, and the Center offers an opportunity for hands on experiences within the campus setting. It also serves as a resource for future social studies teachers, since the State of Connecticut currently recommends the CT Social Studies Frameworks to be included in curriculum for K-12, and proposed legislation for social studies education includes for example a bill to mandate Native American history, with special focus on the Eastern Woodlands peoples.

Scholarly research on Connecticut history is a vibrant field (see the activities of the Association for the Study of Connecticut History-ASCH, and its scholarly journal *Connecticut History Review*).

The Center holds vital historical information for Digital Windham, a new multi-year project initiated by the History Department, involving students and community members.
Goals, Objectives, and Principal Activities:
1. Acquisition of archival collections and other primary materials, as well as relevant book and scholarly journal publications.
2. Preservation and processing of collections, including creation of finding aids, digitization, and creation of databases.
3. Access to non-circulating holdings in the research room, and support for research through the website maintenance, and fielding research inquires.
4. Public history setting for student internships, work study, and volunteer opportunities.
5. Support for academic curriculum development and undergraduate student research.
6. Community involvement through workshops, public lectures, and collaboration with local museums and community researchers.

Principal Accomplishments:
The university website associated with the center is found at the following link:
https://www.easternct.edu/connecticut-studies/index.html

I. Acquisition of Archival collections

Examples of archival collections (for the complete list of collections, see appendix):

Charles Fenton Collection (1860-1924)
This collection offers a glimpse into the career of Captain Charles Fenton, 21st Regiment Connecticut Volunteers, who served during the American Civil War. It includes personal papers and records from his time of service. These include family documents, personal notebooks, photographs and memorabilia plus military correspondence, records and reports related to the distribution of food rations, clothing, equipment, and armaments.

Stanley R. Kokoska Collection (1967-1973)
This collection offers information about Stanley R. Kokoska, Mayor of Willimantic, Connecticut (1967-1969) and active community member. This collection includes correspondence, minutes and reports from the mayor’s office and city council which offer insight into the issues and activities of local government at that time. The collection also offers information about his activities in the community between 1967 and 1973, which include his involvement in the Republican town committee, Citizen’s Action Council, Polish American Club, as teacher at the Windham Regional Technical School, and as director of the Hartford Manpower Program.

Archival collections’ acquisitions measured in linear feet. This is the literal size of collected artifacts on the shelf.
II. Collections Processed Example (for the complete list of collections, see appendix):

Brothertown Indian Nation Collection, 1800-1920, 174 linear feet (58 page boxes).

Brothertown was a Native American community established by a group of Christian Indians from southern New England and Long Island, N.Y., circa 1780s. Its leader, Samson Occom, a Mohegan, attended Eleazar Wheelock’s Indian Charity School in Lebanon, Connecticut. After that, he studied with a Connecticut minister, became a Christian preacher, and moved to Long Island. When he returned to Connecticut, he visited the various tribes, and saw the deteriorating conditions under which they lived. White encroachment on native property had pushed the various tribes onto smaller and smaller parcels of land. Occom began to gather together the Christian Indians from among the Mohegan, Farmington, Narragansetts and other tribes. He and his family acquired land in upstate New York from the Oneida, and were determined to migrate there and begin their own community. The decision to move, however, was interrupted by the American Revolution. By the 1780s, however, migration accelerated, and Brothertown was established circa 1785 by a coalition of Christian Indians. They became known as the Brothertons. Occum remained with the community until his death. Yet Brothertown quickly came under assault by New York State and by the Federal Government. Beginning with Thomas Jefferson, the American people wanted to relocate native Americans west of the Mississippi River. While most people are familiar with the Cherokee removal policy, the program applied to all Indians including the Oneida and the Brothertown people. Many of the Brothertons removed to Wisconsin while others returned to southern New England. There they tried to remain invisible, but nevertheless kept their identity as Brothertown people. Around 2001, two brothers, Ronald Champlain and Maurice Champlain, who represented about 120 descendants of Brothertown inhabitants, brought a lawsuit against the Oneida Indian Nation. They sought help from Barbara Tucker, Director of Connecticut Studies, Eastern Connecticut State University and Marilyn Ford, Quinnipiac Law School, to press their claim. After many years of litigation, their claims ended when the United States Supreme Court ruled against the Oneida land arguments in the case of City of Sherill vs. Oneida Indian Nation of New York. Marilyn Ford donated the materials pertaining to this litigation to Connecticut Studies, Eastern Connecticut State University.
III. The Chronicle

One of the most important sources of information on local history is The Chronicle, a newspaper established in 1877 and covering the news from Windham, Tolland, and New London counties. The Chronicle has always been an invaluable primary source for historians and students. Thomas R. Beardsley based his Willimantic Industry and Community: The Rise and Decline of a Connecticut Textile City (1993) on the information from The Chronicle. Ron Robillard’s Images of America: Windham and Willimantic (2005) and Michael E. Tirone and Peter J. Zizka’s Images of America: Firefighting in Willimantic (2012) made use of the photographic archive of The Chronicle. Local researchers use The Chronicle frequently. Dr. Kirchmann used The Chronicle as one of the sources for her recent publications. Dr. Kirchmann regularly assigns her students in HIS 315: US Between the Wars to research The Chronicle for information on the Great Depression and the New Deal in eastern Connecticut (the most recent syllabus and student papers are on file and available upon request).

The microfilms of the Willimantic Chronicle, which are held by the Connecticut Studies Center, have been purchased from library budget money and paper copies have been kept and matched with the film. From 2019 to the present, the owner of the Willimantic Chronicle has changed a few times and is no longer included in the state newspaper project (through ProQuest), which generated the microfilm. Since the sources of funding for purchasing the microfilm were no longer available, the staff of the Connecticut Studies Center was able to secure a private donor to support microfilming the issues for January 2020 through July 2020. It is unclear what will be source of future funding for this project. Additionally, the new owners of The Chronicle agreed that the Connecticut Studies Center should become the official digital archive for the Willimantic Chronicle starting with January 2021 through the present, which requires cooperation with ITS to be able to secure the needed storage for the files.

IV. Support of community research

The Center’s resources have been heavily used by the community members; for full statistics, please see usage statistics in the appendix. Examples of topics researched:

- Eastern Campus in the Community Since 1889
- Research on Willimantic/Windham Town Hall Records
- Willimantic Businesses
- Willimantic Publications
- Writing Articles for the Willimantic Chronicle
- Writing Articles for the Chronicle of Higher Education
- CT Historic Commission Data and Articles
- State Document Research
- Genealogy Research
- Slave Trade Papers research
V. Selected publications based on recent research at the Connecticut Studies Center.


Barbara Tucker

Anna D. Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann

Bill Powers, a local historian, continues to publish popular articles on local history in *The Chronicle*.

Faculty, Staff, and Responsibilities:
*(Specify Director/Coordinator, Departments/Disciplines of Members, and Time Commitment for each and changes of personnel over time)*

Director / Coordinator: Anna Kirchmann, Ph.D. and Jamel Ostwald, Ph.D. serve as CoDirectors of the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies. Dr. Anna Kirchmann is a CSU Professor and Professor of History. Dr. Ostwald is Professor and Chair of History.
I. Class presentations

The staff of the Connecticut Studies Center holds regular presentations to classes of students by request of teaching faculty. For example, class presentations for history faculty: HIS 200, HIS 250, HIS 255, HIS 302, HIS 305, HIS 307, HIS 311, HIS 320, HIS 325, HIS 342, HIS 400. Classes from other departments also come for presentations and students use the Center’s resources. Here are sample topics they come to research in the area that overlap the collection areas:

- Business Administration - Business Data-Historical
- Communication-Scriptwriting, Communication on campus, study of face to face and electronics communication, images in digital communications
- English-Poetry, Heavy use Special Collections, Local Small Presses/Publishers
- Psychology-Many classes use the CT documents for health and wellness, use of the Old Age Assistance and Town Records for poverty and wellness, use of letters and correspondence on the emotional state of students
- Sociology-Use many of our CT Historic Preservation Collections
- Biology-health issues in CT

II. Student research papers, and publications.

History majors often use the Center’s resources for research, especially for HIS 200 research papers as well as seminar papers. For example, Dr. Kirchmann taught HIS 400: Seminar in American History on the theme “Immigration and Ethnicity in Connecticut and New England” in the Fall 2014, Spring 2016, and Fall 2018. All senior papers from those courses were in some part based on research in the Center’s holdings. As an example, here are titles of student senior seminar papers from Fall 2014:

- Sister Kateri Ludick, “Crossing the Border and Keeping the Faith: Jamaican Immigrants in Hartford Since the 1950s.”
- Alyssa Dubicki, “Fire, faith and Fortitude: Willimantic’s French Canadians and Their national Parish in the Twentieth Century.”

Joe Garzone, “Hartford Peasani: Social mobility of Italian Immigrants in the Twentieth Century.”

Keaton Sanborn, Scottish Immigration in Connecticut: A Look at Windham in the Industrial Era, 1860-1900.”


Paul Bazinet, “The French Canadians of Taftville: A Community of immigrants in the 1920s and 1930s.”

Bethany Niebanck, “The Harp, the Stars and the Dollar: Irish immigrants and Their Motivation for Fighting in the Union Army during the American Civil War.”

Papers by Niebanck and Garzone were subsequently published in the history Department’s online undergraduate student research journal Germina Veris. Kurnyk presented her paper at the first Making History conference at SCSU.

Students from this seminar in following years also had their papers published (for example Lauren Grenier, Sara Dean), and presented at Making History and CREATE (for example Joe White). Dr. Tucker’s students presented a poster at Making History (ECSU) on Charles Fenton, based on their research in the Fenton Collection.

### III. Work study, internships, and volunteering.

Work study students are regularly involved in archival work. Some of them continued to graduate school in public history and/or library studies, for example Margaret Kurnyk, Claire Lavarreda, Dana Mayer, and Allen Horn.

History student volunteers working with Dr. David Naumec assisted in processing the Brothertown Collection (Claire Lavarreda, Madison Cotner). History major Claire Lavarreda is currently (Spring 2021) conducting an internship at the Center, processing archival collection of Dean Helena Miller.

### IV. Exhibits

Three glass display cases located outside the Connecticut Studies Center and inside it by the front door allow for small exhibits on selected themes. Students were involved in research and organization of all those exhibits, providing them with hands-on experience in public history.

- Spring 2021/Summer 2021 - Warrior Women of Connecticut
- Spring 2021 - Women’s Suffrage: Close to Home
- Fall 2020 - Women’s Suffrage: Close to Home
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- Spring 2020/Summer 2020 - Cemetery Research & Memories
- Fall 2019 - Native American Arrow Heads: A New England Collection
- Spring 2019/Summer 2019 - Charles Fenton: The Quartermaster Remembered
- Fall 2018 - Charles Fenton: The Quartermaster Remembered
- Spring 2018/Summer 2016 - Licenses of Windham, Connecticut
- Fall 2017 - Licenses of Windham, Connecticut
- Spring 2017/Summer 2016 - Stubby the War Dog & Other Four Legged Heroes
- Fall 2016 - Stubby the War Dog & Other Four Legged Heroes
- Spring 2016/Summer 2016 - Mapping Willimantic
- Fall 2015 - Mapping Willimantic
- Spring 2015/Summer 2015 - David E. Phillips Folklore Remembered
- Fall 2014 - David E. Phillips Folklore Remembered

Assessment and Evaluation:
(Describe how progress toward meeting goals and objectives has been measured and include a brief description of lessons learned)

Goals nos. 1-3: 1. Acquisition of archival collections and other primary materials, as well as relevant book and scholarly journal publications; 2. Preservation and processing of collections, including creation of finding aids, digitization, and creation of databases; 3. Access to noncirculating holdings in the research room, and support for research through the website maintenance, and fielding research inquires.

Due to the recent retirement of the Director of the Center, a new director must be identified from the current full-time History faculty and renewed connection with the library staff. A new director of the Center should acquire external funding and enhance the visibility of the center both on and off campus and review and update policies, including those of collection accession and de-accession. The library staff should provide access to non-circulating holdings in the research room, and support for research through website maintenance, and fielding research inquires. Modest funding will support digitization of materials and preservation of materials (acid free boxes and folders, etc.), as well as upgrades in technology: upgraded and expanded website and new microfilm readers.

Goals nos. 4-5: 4. Public history setting for student internships, work study, and volunteer opportunities; 5. Support for academic curriculum development and undergraduate student research.

Progress towards these goals will be enhanced through close collaboration with the History Department’s Digital History Lab and Internship Program, especially as it focuses on the multiyear Digital Windham Project. Students will produce original research based in the resources of the Center and contribute it in a public-facing digital form. The Center will continue to provide curriculum support for HIS 200: Historical Research and Writing, which is a required
course for history majors, as well as American history courses. The Center will provide hands-on experience for students exploring career opportunities in public history.

**Goal no. 6: Community involvement through workshops, public lectures, and collaboration with local museums and community researchers.**

Progress toward this goal will be measured through building community networks and connections, with the first step being the establishment of an advisory board.
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**ACTUAL Revenues and Expenses:**
*(For FY 2020, include encumbrances to the end of the approved period, use estimates where necessary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gifts/Grant Support *</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Fund b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operating Fund c</td>
<td>$26,963</td>
<td>$29,368</td>
<td>$30,714</td>
<td>$38,982</td>
<td>$31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Revenue d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOTAL REVENUE (lines 1-4)</td>
<td>$27,263</td>
<td>$29,668</td>
<td>$31,014</td>
<td>$39,282</td>
<td>$32,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel e</td>
<td>$26,963</td>
<td>$28,785</td>
<td>$29,570</td>
<td>$37,998</td>
<td>$31,043.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$166</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>$978</td>
<td>$437</td>
<td>$817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Construction f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Direct Costs (lines 6 through 12)</td>
<td>$26,963</td>
<td>$29,368</td>
<td>$30,714</td>
<td>$38,982</td>
<td>$31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Indirect Costs g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTAL COSTS (lines 13 + 14)</td>
<td>$26,963</td>
<td>$29,368</td>
<td>$30,714</td>
<td>$38,982</td>
<td>$31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. TOTAL REVENUE - TOTAL COSTS</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surplus / (deficit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. OPERATIONAL BALANCE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASAC 10-7-2021 Page 28 of 109
### NOTES:

a. Include and break out revenues from foundations and gift/nonoperational revenues from other sources. Provide description in Budget Narrative.
b. Include revenues for support of Center/Institute from block grant (e.g. Reassigned time for faculty supported on block grant).
c. Include revenues for support of Center/Institute from operating funds (e.g. tuition and fees).
d. Other revenue includes operating revenue (fees charged to participants, event fees, etc.) and/or other sources not listed above. Provide description in Budget Narrative.
e. Include breakout and costs for faculty reassigned time and costs for other personnel. Provide detail and FTE estimate in proposal narrative on faculty and staff involvement.
f. Include breakout and costs for new construction and costs for renovation or upgrade of existing facility/space. 
g. Estimate costs for facilities use, utilities consumption, etc.

### 2021 Center/Institute Report Template
Page 11 of 15

**CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES Connecticut State Universities**
Center/Institute Report – Seven-Year Sunset Report/Review for Continuation **PROJECTED**

### Revenues and Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gifts/Grant Support a</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Fund b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operating Fund c</td>
<td>$27,371</td>
<td>$30,155</td>
<td>$30,555</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Revenue d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOTAL REVENUE (lines 1-4)</td>
<td>$27,671</td>
<td>$30,455</td>
<td>$30,855</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel e</td>
<td>$25,223</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Construction f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Direct Costs (lines 6 through 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Indirect Costs g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTAL COSTS (lines 13 + 14)</td>
<td>$27,371</td>
<td>$30,155</td>
<td>$30,555</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. TOTAL REVENUE - TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**surplus / (deficit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. OPERATIONAL BALANCE from previous year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NOTES:**

- **a.** Include and break out revenues from foundations and gift/nonoperational revenues from other sources. Provide description in Budget Narrative.
- **b.** Include revenues for support of Center/Institute from block grant (e.g., reassigned time for faculty supported on block grant).
- **c.** Include revenues for support of Center/Institute from operating funds (e.g., tuition and fees).
- **d.** Other revenue includes operating revenue (fees charged to participants, event fees, etc.) and/or other sources not listed above. Provide description in Budget Narrative.
- **e.** Include breakout and costs for faculty reassigned time and costs for other personnel. Provide detail and FTE estimate in proposal narrative on faculty and staff involvement.
- **f.** Include breakout and costs for new construction and costs for renovation or upgrade of existing facility/space.
- **g.** Estimate costs for facilities use, utilities consumption, etc.
Budget Narrative:
(Provide any important context about ACTUAL and PROJECTED Revenues and Expenses)

Eastern Connecticut State University’s operating funds covers most of the expenses of this Center. These include a one quarter (3 FLCs per semester) release time for the Director, and a modest student worker and supply budget.

The Eastern Connecticut State University’s Foundation has a temporarily restricted fund started in 1998. The current balance is approximately $15,000.

APPENDICES
1. List of archival collections - available upon request
2. List of newspapers: microfilm and print collections - available upon request
3. Maps and city directories - available upon request
4. Usage statistics by semester - available upon request
5. Letters of support:
   a. Bill Powers, local historian and author
   b. Dr. Edmond Chibeau, Communications Department, ECSU
   c. Dr. Walter Woodward, State Historian and author
   d. Dr. Jamie Eves, Executive Director of the Windham Textile and History Museum
   e. Dr. David Naumec, Adjunct Assistant Professor, ECSU, Public Historian

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

P.O. Box 12
Windham, CT. 06280

April 15, 2021

Dr. Anna Kirchmann
Interim Co-director
The David Roth Center for Connecticut Studies
Eastern Connecticut State University
Willimantic, CT. 06226

Dear Dr. Kirchmann:
I am pleased to support the Center’s re-accreditation by the CSU Board of Regents. As a long-term member of the Association for the Study of Connecticut History and a retired history and social sciences teacher, I have true appreciation for the Center’s goals, objectives and activities and the need for its continued support and success.

My most recent experience with the Center confirms that it truly provides a veritable paradise of important historical information about Eastern Connecticut. During the past 16 months, I have written a weekly column for the Willimantic Chronicle titled “The Threads That Connect Us” about the rich local history of Willimantic, Windham, and the area’s other towns and villages. My ability to have access to the Center’s primary sources has proven to be a major factor for making this possible.

From time to time, the Center’s resources have also contributed to my writing as a contributor on a regular basis to “Neighbors: A Little Paper Big On Community” a monthly paper “serving the inhabitants of northeastern Connecticut.”

Finally, the new learnings I have acquired through my association with the Center have allowed me to become more knowledgeable and hopefully a more interesting volunteer teacher at the Windham Textile & History Museum in Willimantic.

As a community member and a writer about the area’s history, I enthusiastically support the Center and its unique role in helping to provide us all with the valuable archival collections, primary materials and other important historic data. It is important for our residents to have firsthand access to the nature of our past, including how people lived and especially their concerns, issues, needs and problems.

Sincerely,
Bill Powers

April 23, 2021

To Whom It May Concern

I am writing to offer my wholehearted support for the Connecticut Studies Collection and archives to be continued as a CENTER OF EXCELLENCE. The Connect Studies Collection has been of great help to both myself and my students. The staff has not simply given us access to records but helped us find recondite material that is not easily accessible.

I have often used the Connecticut studies collection for my own research and for preparation for class.
My students have used the collection to write and research assignments, and two alumnae have come back after they graduated to make use of the center.

My students have collaborated with students from other departments in researching elements of Connecticut History in preparation for presentations both on and off campus. Among those areas of research are:

- Windham mills
- Civil War in Willimantic, Hartford, Norwich, and Stanford
- Samuel Huntington, born in Windham, moved to Scotland, CT
- Looking up records of their own family

Students have been helped in their research and made to feel welcome by both faculty and student workers at the Connecticut History Collection. It is indeed a center of excellence!

Edmond Chibeau Ph.D.
Communication Department
Eastern Connecticut State University
April 22, 2021

Dr. Anna Kirchmann  
Dr. Jamel Ostwald  
Center for Connecticut Studies  
Eastern Connecticut State University  
J. Eugene Smith Library, Room 473  
83 Windham St  
Willimantic, CT 0622

Professors Kirchmann and Ostwald,

I am writing in support of re-accreditation for the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University. As the state historian and as a professor at the University of Connecticut, I can attest both to the importance and uniqueness of this needed repository of primary and secondary materials. There is no other facility in the region – including the University of Connecticut – that has the resources available at the David Roth Center for Connecticut Studies. The archival collections, vital records, town records, maps, newspapers, books, and ephemera are, in many cases, unique to the center. They are a vital resource for scholars, educators, museum professionals, students, and the general public.

I can personally attest to the extraordinary value that the Center has for public historians (museum professionals, town historians, association, historical society, and local historians) as I live in the region and have experienced first-hand the need to examine materials that are only found at the Center. For certain aspects of regional historical research necessary for museum exhibits, historical commemorations, community history appreciation, and public audience engagement, the David Roth Center for Connecticut Studies is a critical resource.
Eastern Connecticut’s future is inextricably linked to appreciation of its past. The revitalization of our communities will work best when community members are aware of and inspired by the recognition of the events and acts that first gave our region prominence, former challenges met and overcome, and opportunities presented by the past that is all around us. The David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies is an indispensable resource for making this possible. I strongly urge renewal of its accreditation.

Sincerely,

Walter W. Woodward
Connecticut State Historian
Associate Professor of History

17 April 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter supports the reaccreditation of the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut State University. I am writing this letter in my capacity as Executive Director of the Windham Textile and History Museum and as the Town of Windham, CT Municipal Historian.

The Roth Center is an invaluable resource for local historians. Most history museums in eastern Connecticut are small, with limited budgets. The Roth Center’s collections of primary source documents, vital records, town records, maps, local newspapers, and other
materials make it the go-to location for doing local history research in Connecticut’s three eastern counties. The staff is both professional and helpful, sensitive to the needs of local historians. I personally use the Center’s resources multiple times a year, and am always grateful that it is there. To give an idea of the Center’s value, let me cite just three recent examples.

(1) The Town of Windham, CT, like most towns, lacks the space or financial resources to properly store and maintain any but the most recent Town records. When a large number of valuable, older records became endangered by conditions at the Town’s 1896 Town Hall, the Roth Center came to the rescue. Roth Center staff and Town staff worked out a memorandum of understanding in which those records were moved to the Roth Center, where they can be maintained under climate-controlled conditions, protected against decay, and — of vital importance — made readily available to townspeople. A few months ago, during the COVID lockdowns, I received a distress email from the Windham Town Clerk: certain materials needed to be evacuated from Town Hall immediately. I rushed to Town Hall, where I met a staff member from the Roth Center who had also hurried down, and together we were able to move the materials to the Roth Center. Roth Center staff cataloged the materials, determined which were duplicates, and then transferred the duplicates to the Windham Textile and History Museum. The Museum is short-staffed — the duplicates we have still await cataloging. But the copies that went to the Roth Center are cataloged and on the shelves, where townspeople can use them.

(2) When a developer proposed demolishing several historic buildings on Main Street in Willimantic, CT, I met with local activists at the Roth Center, where we found a wealth of records, photos, and other information about the structures. Armed with this information, the activists were able to convince the State Historic Protection Office to negotiate the terms of the demolition so that portions of the structures could be preserved.

(3) The Windham Textile and History Museum recently mounted an exhibit to observe the 100th anniversary of woman suffrage in Connecticut. We wanted to include information from one of the local newspapers, the Willimantic Chronicle, in the exhibit, focusing on the 1920 Presidential election in Willimantic and surrounding towns. Although the Chronicle is still being published, the new owner (an out-of-town entity) no longer maintains a morgue. The only microfilm version of the Chronicle available was at the Roth Center. Thanks to the Center’s prescience in making the microfilm, the Museum was able to determine the name of the first woman in Willimantic to vote in a Presidential election, as well as craft an exhibit that told the story of that important election on the local level.

In these ways, the Roth Center preserves and makes available to the people their own history. It is impossible to overstate how important that is. Its vision, professionalism, helpfulness, and commitment to local history makes the Roth Center a vital part of the eastern Connecticut history community.

Jamie H. Eves

Jamie H. Eves, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Windham Textile and History Museum
411 Main Street
Willimantic, CT
April 23, 2021
Dr. David J. Naumec
Scotland, CT 06264 davidnaumec@gmail.com
Dr. Anna Kirchmann
Dr. Jamel Ostwald
Center for Connecticut Studies
Eastern Connecticut State University
J. Eugene Smith Library, Room 473
Willimantic, CT 0622

Professors Kirchmann and Ostwald,

I am writing to strongly support the re-accreditation of the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies located at the J. Eugene Smith Library at Eastern Connecticut State University. As a historian, museum professional, and adjunct History professor I have relied on the David Roth Center for Connecticut Studies for nearly twenty years as an important, local, research institution. There is no other repository in the region which focuses on both the history of the State and Eastern Connecticut in particular. The Center is an increasingly important resource for historians, genealogists, educators, students, and the public as well as an inviting and professional research institution.

In 2004 I first visited the Center for Connecticut Studies while researching my Master’s Thesis at Tufts University regarding Connecticut Indians in the Civil War. As an Eastern Connecticut resident I was aware of this unique repository and scheduled a visit along with other archives included the Connecticut State Library, the Connecticut Historical Society, and the University of Connecticut Libraries. To my surprise the Center had many of the local histories I required along with a strong selection of local Native American history and I soon researched there regularly. During my time as Senior Researcher at the Mashantucket Pequot Museum I continued to visit due to its convenient location saving unnecessary travel to libraries in Hartford and beyond. As I became more involved at ECSU as an Adjunct History Professor I found the Center for Connecticut Studies to be an excellent resource for students seeking experience in the fields of history, library science, or public history which resulted in several ongoing research projects and a Native American artifact exhibition in recent years. Such opportunities for career development have been valuable for graduating seniors and for those applying to graduate school.
It is important that the David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies continues as a valuable resource to both the community here at ECSU and the State as a whole. It currently stands as one of the noteworthy research centers in the State, such as those in Hartford, New Haven or Fairfield, but is unique in its location, specialization, and archival holdings. As such, I strongly support the renewal of accreditation for the Center of Connecticut Studies.

Sincerely,

David J. Naumec, Ph.D
Adjunct History Professor, ECSU
History Instructor, TRCC
RESOLUTION

concerning

Approval of Modification of the Mission Statement for

Eastern Connecticut State University

October 21, 2021

RESOLVED, That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the Modification of the Mission Statement for Eastern Connecticut State University.

A True Copy:

Alice Pritchard, Secretary of the
CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
ITEM
Approval of modification of the mission statement for Eastern Connecticut State University

BACKGROUND
Connecticut State Statute grants authority to the Board of Regents to “review and approve mission statements for the Connecticut State University System,” now the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities (Chapter 185, Section 10a-6).

As part of Eastern’s most recent Strategic Planning process, the mission statement was revised to make it shorter and more concise, while still reflecting the University’s mission as Connecticut’s only public liberal arts institution. The process was led by the Committee on the Future of Eastern (COFE), Eastern’s strategic planning committee and involved several surveys and open forums to solicit input from students, faculty, and staff. The revised mission statement was approved by the University Senate on February 4, 2020.

This revised mission statement is consistent with the mission of the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities:

The Connecticut State Colleges & Universities (CSCU) contribute to the creation of knowledge and the economic growth of the state of Connecticut by providing affordable, innovative, and rigorous programs. Our learning environments transform students and facilitate an ever-increasing number of individuals to achieve their personal and career goals.

It is also consistent with the mission of the Connecticut State Universities:

As part of the Connecticut State Colleges & Universities system, the four Connecticut State Universities offer exemplary and affordable undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to degrees in the liberal arts, sciences, fine arts, applied fields, and professional disciplines. They advance and extend knowledge, research, learning and culture while preparing students to enter the workforce and to contribute to the civic life of Connecticut's communities. Through a variety of living and learning environments, the Universities ensure access and diversity to meet the needs of a broad range of students. They support an atmosphere of inter-campus learning, the exploration of technological and global influences and the application of knowledge to promote economic growth and social justice.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Board of Regents approve the modification of the mission statement for Eastern Connecticut State University.
Memorandum

To: Board of Regents for the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities

From: William M. Salka, Provost, Eastern Connecticut State University

RE: Revised Mission Statement

Date: September 20, 2021

As part of Eastern’s most recent Strategic Planning process, the mission statement was revised to make it shorter and more concise, while still reflecting the University’s mission as Connecticut’s only public liberal arts institution. The process was led by the Committee on the Future of Eastern (COFE), Eastern’s strategic planning committee and involved several surveys and open forums to solicit input from students, faculty, and staff. The revised mission statement was approved by the University Senate on February 4, 2020.

Eastern respectfully requests that the Board of Regents approve this revised mission statement.

“Eastern Connecticut State University engages students from diverse backgrounds in a transformative liberal arts learning experience that provides knowledge and skills to lead enriching, purposeful lives.”

Previous Mission Statement:

The mission of Eastern Connecticut State University, the state’s designated public liberal arts university, is to provide high quality undergraduate and select graduate programs to a diverse population of talented students. Eastern’s inclusive residential campus, outstanding faculty, emphasis on teaching excellence and exceptional facilities raise students’ aspirations and cultivate engagement, inquiry, integrity and social responsibility. In the traditional arts and sciences, as well as in pre-professional programs that are grounded in the liberal arts, Eastern students apply theory in practical settings. Faculty research, scholarship, creative work and community engagement inform teaching and learning, advance knowledge and enrich the liberal arts curriculum. The University is committed to serving the state of Connecticut and the nation by preparing its students for their future personal, professional and public roles, as leaders in both their communities and professional fields.
WHEREAS, Eastern Connecticut State University’s Committee on the Future of Eastern (COFE III) was charged with revision of the University’s Mission Statement; and

WHEREAS, input was sought from the University community via two forums and an online survey; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Mission Statement language was preferred by a clear majority; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, the Eastern University Senate endorses the adoption of the new Mission Statement: “Eastern Connecticut State University engages students from diverse backgrounds in a transformative liberal arts learning experience that provides knowledge and skills to lead enriching, purposeful lives.”
RESOLUTION

concerning

Report of the CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force

October 21, 2021

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education accept the submission of the “Final Report and Recommendations” from the CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force.

A True Copy:

_____________________________________
Alice Pritchard, Secretary of the
CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
ITEM
Consideration of the “Final Report and Recommendations” from the CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force.

BACKGROUND
The CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force was formed on August 20, 2020, by the Connecticut Board of Regents, under the direction of the system provost and Interim president, Dr. Jane Gates. The charge of the group was to “identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU” and “to advance multicultural and diverse quality education.” The task force met for the first time on October 30, 2021, and then monthly throughout the 2020-2021 academic year. There were 18 original members of the task force, 2 of whom were unable to complete their terms, reducing final membership of the task force to 16. Membership to the task force was achieved through open calls for nominations and members were chosen by the co-chairs, with preference given to representation from faculty, students, law enforcement, and the community. Dr. Gates appointed Dr. Tuesday Cooper – Professor of Criminal Justice, Manchester Community College and Dr. William Lugo -Professor of Criminology, Eastern Connecticut State University, to co-chair the task force.

RECOMMENDATION
It is the recommendation of the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs that the Board of Regents accepts the submission of this report.

10/07/2021 – BOR-Academic and Student Affairs Committee
10/21/2021 – Board of Regents
September 3, 2021

CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force

Dr. Tuesday L. Cooper, co-chair
Dr. William Lugo, co-chair

Final Report and Recommendations
Overview

The CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force was formed on August 20, 2020, by the Connecticut Board of Regents, under the direction of the system provost and Interim president, Dr. Jane Gates. The charge of the group was to “identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU” and “to advance multicultural and diverse quality education.”

The task force met for the first time on October 30, 2021, and then monthly throughout the 2020-2021 academic year. There were 18 original members of the task force, 2 of which were unable to complete their terms, reducing final membership of the task force to 16. Membership to the task force was achieved through open calls for nominations and members were chosen by the co-chairs, with preference given to representation from faculty, students, law enforcement, and the community. Dr. Gates appointed Dr. Tuesday Cooper – Professor of Criminal Justice, Manchester Community College and Dr. William Lugo -Professor of Criminology, Eastern Connecticut State University, to co-chair the task force.

Task force members were divided into four subcommittees (Curriculum, Enrollment, Administrative Program, and Program History), with each subcommittee focused on a different area of the Board of Regents’ original charge. Two midterm reports were completed (the first in January 2021, the second in May 2021) and delivered electronically to Interim President Gates, highlighting the progress of the task force up to that point.

In Spring 2021, the task force also completed three additional reports, based on separate surveys given to faculty, students and law enforcement. Funding for the surveys was provided by the Davis Foundation through a $10,000 grant which the task force applied for, with Eastern Connecticut State University serving as the grant recipient.*

*Note: Eastern was chosen as the grant recipient as the grant guidelines required that the application be submitted by the President of a four-year institution.
Task force Members

Senator Saud Anwar, CT Senator, 3rd District

Corrie Betts, Hartford NAACP Criminal Justice Chair

Cheyenne Bermudez, Central Connecticut State University, Student

Karen Boisvert, Police Officer Standards and Training Council, Administrator

Tuesday L. Cooper, Manchester Community College, Professor (Co-Chair)

Tom Cossette, Police Officer Standards and Training Council, Training Officer

Greg DeSantis, Connecticut State Colleges and University, VP of Student Success and Academic Initiatives

June Dunn, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Associate Dean of Student Outreach and Enhanced Learning

Terrence Dwyer, Western Connecticut State University, Professor

Jeffrey Garewski, Eastern Connecticut State University, Chief-of-Police

Steven Hernández, The Commission on Women, Seniors, Equity & Opportunity, Executive Director

Zaira Hernandez, Eastern Connecticut State University, Student

William Lugo, Eastern Connecticut State University, Professor (Co-Chair)

Frank Marmo, Municipal Training Academy, FBI Special Agent, New Haven/CT Police Veteran

Althea Seaborn, Norwalk Community College, Professor

Kobie Stewart, Asnuntuck Community College, Professor
Meeting Schedule*

Full CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force

October 30, 2020    November 20, 2020    December 18, 2020
January 22, 2021    February 19, 2021    March 26, 2021
April 23, 2021      May 21, 2021

Subcommittee Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Program</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Program History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>11/13/20</td>
<td>11/12/20</td>
<td>11/18/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/20</td>
<td>12/11/20</td>
<td>12/9/20</td>
<td>12/15/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/21</td>
<td>1/15/21</td>
<td>1/14/21</td>
<td>1/13/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/21</td>
<td>2/19/21</td>
<td>2/19/21</td>
<td>3/18/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>5/17/21</td>
<td>3/16/21</td>
<td>5/5/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee Membership:

Administrative Program: Karen Boisvert, June Dunn, Jeff Garewski, William Lugo, Kobie Stewart

Enrollment: Greg DeSantis, William Lugo, Althea Seaborn

Curriculum: Corrie Betts, Tuesday Cooper, Thomas Cossette, Steven Hernández, Zaira Hernandez, Frank Marmo

Program History: Tuesday Cooper, Terrence Dwyer

Co-Chair Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/16/20</td>
<td>12/1/2020</td>
<td>12/11/20</td>
<td>1/5/2021</td>
<td>1/26/2021</td>
<td>2/2/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/2021</td>
<td>8/10/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: all meetings held virtually via MS Teams, Webex or Zoom
Task Force Recommendations

The charge given to the task force encompassed 3 key areas:

**Charge 1:** Describe the status quo of the criminal justice programming and education in the CSCU system and nationwide.

**Charge 2:** Advance multicultural and diverse quality education.

**Charge 3:** Formulate tangible and practical ideals for Criminal Justice studies in the CSCU system

**Charge 1: Criminal Justice Programming in the CSCU System and Nationwide**

Needed from charge: 1. Overview of origins of history of CSCU CJ programs  
2. Enrollment trends (faculty and student)  
3. Recruitment of diverse students

Findings

The Academic Program History subcommittee received and reviewed program reviews (or similar documents/websites) from the CSUs and the Connecticut Community Colleges Criminal Justice and Criminology Degrees Curriculum Alignment Report. While it was found that none of the academic programs had intentionally built antiracist programming and curriculum from the start, all that were reviewed had some components which explored how diversity played a role in law enforcement/criminal justice. In addition, there was very little in the criminal justice (CJ) curriculum of any four-year program, or that of the CT Community Colleges alignment plan, regarding mental health issues and how it ties in with the field of criminal justice. There were three courses listed (which were adopted by 2 colleges) that addressed the issue. It was acknowledged by faculty that these concepts may be embedded within coursework.

In the fall, the committee received data from the CSCU system office that enrollment in CJ programs has varied dramatically within the CSCU system- declining steadily and dramatically over the previous decade within the community colleges by 36%. The story is more positive at the CSU’s, with enrollment increasing 3% over the same period (note: this does not include ECSU and SCSU, which did not have criminology programs
at the time). Over the last five years, with the inclusion of new CJ majors at ECSU and SCSU, overall matriculants in CJ have been increasing within CSCU. Data from the CSCU system office also showed that people of color are well represented in CJ programs across the system. However, while people of color are well represented in CJ programs, they are underrepresented when it comes to graduation rates. In fact, the percentage of minorities who are enrolled in CJ programs drops by over 30% when it comes to representation among graduates. The exact opposite is true for white students—their representation increases by over 30% when it comes to representation among graduates. Our recommendations attempt to close this gap, creating greater equity among student populations.

The task force collected additional data via a survey sent to CSCU students in Spring 2021. (See Appendix B.) Data from the survey revealed that 25% of students were interested in criminal justice majors. Survey respondents also identified a few barriers that could explain why the interest does not match enrollment in CJ programs. First, there is an internship requirement for criminal justice programs throughout the system. Also, the internships are unpaid. The majority of students responded that this presents a significant burden to them, as there is competition between family obligations, other employment obligations, etc. Second, students identified the social stigma attached to careers in law enforcement (e.g., the public’s negative image of the police) as impacting their decisions to become criminal justice majors.

**Recommendations**

a) Develop a website that supports an antiracist framework for criminal justice curriculum and departments. (See Appendix C, for examples of model websites)
b) When adopting the goal of having an intentionally antiracist curriculum in criminal justice programming, a framework such as the scale of continuum, should be adopted in order to identify, set and monitor goals. (See Appendix D)
c) Concepts and theories related to mental health should be considered as a more transparent part of the curriculum.
d) Offer students paid internships, which could be supported by grants, collaborations with industry, and/or system budgeting.
**Charge 2: Advance multicultural and diverse quality education**

Needed from charge: 1. Are CSCU CJ programs preparing students to work in diverse environments?

2. Is curriculum/research/service antiracist?

Findings

Data from the faculty survey conducted in Spring 2021 showed that a majority (55%) of faculty stated that their programs are helping prepare students to work in a diverse environment by offering a diversity requirement within their criminal justice major. However, when asked whether there was an explicit antiracist focus in their criminal justice curriculum, only 36% indicated that there was. Of the faculty respondents, over half (54%) indicated that antiracism was a part of their research agenda and 71% indicated that it was part of their professional service endeavors. When asked whether their teaching had an antiracist focus, 63% reported in the affirmative. Lastly, there is support for having diversity and an antiracist focus in the criminal justice curriculum. Over 70% of faculty believe that diversity should be part of the curriculum and 65% believe that there should be an antiracist focus. This support drops significant though when asked about whether either should be a requirement, dropping to 57% and 56% respectively.

The task force concluded its work on developing a set of guiding principles for an antiracist curriculum, pedagogy, education, and program objectives. While there was no consensus formed (which should offer insight into the difficulty in getting broader consensus from all faculty on these issues), its many discussions did provide the framework for a larger discussion of these issues. Overall, the task force did agree that having a hub for diversity materials, activities, and programming would be key to assisting faculty with capacity building and providing best practices in this area.
Recommendations

a) Create a system-wide resource for all related materials which could assist faculty with diversity and antiracist capacity building.
b) Have a designated coordinator (faculty member) in each program charged with maintaining said resource for a course release or similar compensation.
c) Link resources with the systemwide Diversity, Equity and Inclusion efforts to help establish common definitions, supportive resources, and shared programming.
d) Work with CJ faculty to create an interdisciplinary course on Critical Race Theory or Race and Justice for undergraduate students.

Charge 3: Formulate Tangible and Practical Ideals for CJ Studies in the CSCU System

Needed from charge: 1. Propose systemwide recommendations to advance CJ studies
   2. Make recommendations regarding the relationship between CSCU CJ programs and law enforcement entities.

Findings

As mentioned previously, the task force surveys found many programmatic issues that could impact student success, like unpaid internships. While the majority of students reported that unpaid internships present a roadblock, 56% of students of color indicated that the internship being unpaid would prevent them from accepting the opportunity. This could impact both graduation and retention rates. In addition, 90% of students of color indicated that a paid internship would help them in their college success. Only 39% of students of color reported that their institutions were helpful to them in obtaining an internship. Students of color were more likely to report greater levels of dissatisfaction with the internships that they did secure, as compared to all students.
Next, students reported that having a faculty mentor would be a welcomed opportunity (60% of students stated that faculty mentors would “definitely” help them succeed). Although peer mentoring was explored as well, only 39% of students polled thought it would be helpful to them.

Third, textbook costs were of great concern to students with over 70% of students identifying that financial assistance in the area would “definitely” help them to be successful in college. Last, the subcommittee explored experiential learning, and the potential credits associated with said learning, as a way to address retention and graduation rates. Only 1/3 of the students surveyed appeared to be aware of this opportunity.

A survey conducted with law enforcement academy trainers and new recruits collected data regarding recruits’ skillsets and preparation to engage with diverse populations. First, it should be noted that there was a significant disconnect between the levels at which the recruits rated themselves and the trainers rating of recruits. In fact, all categories had over a 20% differential between recruits and trainer ratings, with the exception of three categories (Emotional Skills - “Showing Empathy,” and “Friendliness” and Other Soft Skills – “High Ethical Standards”). The most significant scoring differences between recruits and trainers, of over 40% points, were; in Emotional Skills - “Managing Own Anxiety” (+44%); in Communication Skills - “Giving Clear Communication” (+51%), “Being Confident Under Stress” (+55%), “Using Positive Non-Verbal Communication” (+56%) and “Engaging in Active Listening” (+43); and Other Soft Skills - “Critical Thinking” (48+).” These differences show that what recruits view as their greatest strength (communication skills), trainers view as their greatest weakness.

In rating their Engagement Readiness, over 60% of both recruits and trainers stated that recruits were either “very” or “somewhat” prepared to engage with diverse populations (including racial and ethnic minorities, illegal immigrants, members of the LGBTQ and people with disabilities). In addition, over 60% of trainers and recruits also rated that recruits were either “very” or “somewhat” prepared to engage with persons experiencing a mental health episode, someone under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and victim who refused to cooperate.

Trainers also felt that a recruit with an educational level above high school diploma would be successful. Trainers stated that 72% of recruits would be “excellent or good” at their jobs with an associate degree, while 89% agreed that
recruits with a bachelor’s degree would fall into that category. Over half (58%) of
the trainers believed that recruits would be successful with a high school
diploma.

**Recommendations**

a) Partner with private industry for paid internships.
b) Explore grant funding for paid internship opportunities.
c) Explore a systemwide equity campaign similar to the Minnesota State
   University System’s Equity 2030
   (https://www.minnstate.edu/Equity2030/index.html) which seeks to
   promote access and student success among underserved students within the
   state.
d) Work with CJ programs to implement more extensive diversity and antiracist
   curriculum.
e) Explore a pathway/certificate with police departments and other law
   enforcement entities in diversity/antiracist education.
f) Partner with law enforcement academies and professional development arms
   of law enforcement to offer academic courses or professional development in
   critical thinking, social-emotional learning, and communication.
g) Develop a system-wide faculty mentor program for students of color and
   other underserved populations.
h) Expand system-wide aid given to bookstores for student use, there should be
   greater adoption of Open Education Resources and digital textbooks among
   faculty.
i) Work with continuing education offices to more aggressively promote life
   experience credits for students.
Other Considerations

One task force member was unable to attend many meetings, but still felt strongly about the task force’s charge and wanted to offer feedback - Connecticut State Senator Saud Anwar. Citing state higher education, and specifically community colleges, as the potential “great equalizer,” he believes that the Connecticut State Colleges and University system is uniquely positioned to be a leader in the effort to create antiracist curriculum, policies and practices. He suggested that there is capacity building that can be done in the areas of critical thinking and the ability to have frank conversations about the state of our society today. Senator Anwar believes that we have to continue to have honest dialogue about acknowledging past and current realities as it relates to the experiences of citizens of diverse racial and ethnic background. He is pleased that the state has faculty, staff and community members who have invested their time to address this important issue. He also believed the CSCU system can consider making an affirmative, public facing statement regarding its intentions to become an antiracist organization in regards to curriculum, policies and practices. Finally, the CSCU system should consider creating an Institute on Race and Justice which will house all of the updates, capacity building, professional development, and research materials.

Conclusions

The recommendations made by this task force should be considered a needs assessment of the CSCU system. The recommendations will take time, effort, and resources to fully implement. A strategic plan would be the next logical step. Thus, it is the hope of the task force that this is the beginning of the conversation, and not the end.
Appendix A: Task Force Charge

Connecticut State Colleges and Universities (CSCU)
Criminal Justice Task Force

The charge of the group will be to identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU. The role of the task force is to advance multicultural and diverse quality education, which enables and enhances students’ ability to function and relate effectively in a multicultural society.

The group will examine and describe the status quo of the criminal justice programming and education in the CSCU system; research and provide information about criminal justice programming and education nationwide so we can formulate tangible and practical ideals and a vision for studies and activities in Connecticut; and set a vision and make recommendations setting the path for how we work to achieve the ideal.

In addition, the Charge to the CSCU Criminal Justice taskforce asks the group to:

1) Provide an overview of the origins and histories of CSCU criminal law, criminal justice studies programs within a national context;

2) Identify faculty and student enrollment trends in CSCU criminal law and criminal justice studies offerings (particularly over the past 20 years);

3) Examine cost-effective approaches that promote program quality and excellence;

4) Determine if programs are recruiting a diverse group of students and preparing graduates to work effectively in a diverse society and contribute to advancing equity;

5) Ascertained whether CSCU research, teaching, and service in criminal justice are intentionally antiracist;

6) Propose systemwide recommendations related to the advancement of criminal justice studies that are responsive to the mission of CSCU and to the needs of our students, Connecticut, and society in general;

and
7) Make recommendations, as appropriate, regarding the relationship between CSCU criminal justice programs and law enforcement entities.

To this end, the task force will examine academic program objectives and what similar educational programs look like, state-wide, regionally, and nationwide. In addition, student and faculty demographics (race/ethnicity, gender, socio-economic class, degree completion, organizational membership) and statistics in terms of enrollment, graduation rates, transfer rates, and job placement will be documented. Recruitment and retention practices for both faculty and students will be documented and examined for effectiveness and efficiency in terms of representing the demographics of the state/region/nation (as it pertains to students and faculty of color). Next, the curriculum and co-curricular activities will be examined for intention in terms of working with diverse populations and increasing equity in education (will involve curriculum mapping) and access to effective representation and participation in the criminal justice system. Teaching, research and service efforts and opportunities will be examined for intentional opportunities to move forward antiracists objectives. Lastly programs will be reviewed, to evaluate intentional relationships built to engage and make connections with local and regional law enforcement agencies and professional organizations (for both students and faculty).
Appendix B: Reports

Faculty Survey Results*
2021

Overview

The CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force was formed on August 20, 2020, by the Connecticut Board of Regents, under the direction of the system provost, Dr. Jane Gates. Dr. Gates appointed Drs. Tuesday Cooper (Manchester Community College) and William Lugo (Eastern Connecticut State University) to co-chair the task force. The charge of the group was to “identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU.” On October 30, 2020, the task force met for the first time and decided that in order to complete their charge, they required further data from CSCU criminal justice faculty. On November 24, 2020, the survey was submitted for IRB approval and on December 23, 2020, it received approval from Eastern Connecticut State University’s Committee on the Use of Human Subjects (IRB Protocol #2033). The survey was administered from January 15, 2021, through February 15, 2021. In total, 60 criminal justice faculty participated in the survey, with roughly half coming from community colleges (53%) and half from the CSUs (47%).

*This survey was made possible with a grant from the Davis Educational Foundation, which was established by Stanton and Elisabeth Davis after Mr. Davis’s retirement as chairman of Shaw’s Supermarkets, Inc.
Summary

Introduction

Respondents to this survey were very similar to the actual criminal justice (CJ) faculty population- 57% were male and 41% female. Demographic data from other national surveys had gender distributions which were 54% male and 41% female (Zippia.com, 2019). Age was also comparable to other national data; In this survey the average age was around 50 years old, compared to 47 years in other surveys. In terms of institutional distribution, survey data was comparable to the broader system, with 53% of survey respondents from community colleges and 47% from the CSUs. This was almost identical to the actual system data where 55% of CJ faculty are from community colleges and 45% are from the CSUs. Roughly three quarters of the respondents were white, and over 70% were full time instructors. The survey was sent to all instructors who taught within criminal justice programs in the CSCU system in Spring 2021. The overall response rate was 49%.

Table 1. Faculty Who Were Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary/other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial/other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn. State Universities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity and Antiracism

There is broad support among faculty in CJ when it comes to issues of diversity and antiracism. Nearly three-quarters of faculty (73%) believe that the CJ major at their institution should have a diversity course requirement, while 65% believe their programs should have an antiracist focus. Support drops considerably, however, when it comes to mandating such requirements (though it stays above 50% for both diversity and antiracist courses). Part of the reason could be the lack of consensus around such definitions, as one-quarter of faculty answered “it depends” when it came to requiring these courses in the major and another 37% of faculty said there was no clear consensus around these definitions or they were unsure if there was consensus. Further, these issues have received considerable press in the last year, and perhaps faculty worry about the politicization of their courses and curriculum with any mandates. When it came to faculty research, of those faculty who conduct research, over half (54%) said antiracism was at least part of their research agenda. For those faculty who engage in professional service, a very high percentage (71%) said it involved an antiracist focus most or some of the time. All of these data suggest that there are positive signs in working with faculty on such issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Diversity and Antiracism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have a diversity course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>requirement as part of CJ major?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should CJ major have a diversity course requirement?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would you support requiring a diversity course requirement?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does CJ major have an explicit antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should CJ major have an antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would you support requiring an antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your teaching have an antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your research have an antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your service have an antiracist focus?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there consensus within your program around meaning of diversity and antiracism?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Comments

Diversity- Mandating a course

The survey included two open-ended questions that asked faculty why they might choose to support, or not support, adding diversity courses to their curriculum. Most faculty overwhelmingly supported adding diversity courses. Of the thirty-five written comments, 28 were in support of adding diversity courses to their curriculum, with most saying the issue was “important for students to understand.” Only four faculty wrote comments against adding this requirement. Of those four negative comments, two were in support of the concept of diversity, just not adding specific courses. For example, one faculty member wrote that diversity issues “should be addressed as appropriate in each course rather than having a specific class that is taken once and forgotten.” Another faculty member felt that diversity itself was “already a basic tenet of criminal justice.” In fact, only one faculty member was against adding diversity courses as a principle, stating that “…it further divides. It only refers to diversity issues in the Black community, & not the White community.” Six of the thirty-five comments supported the concept of diversity courses, but felt it depended on “who” was teaching it, or “what” was in the curriculum. One faculty member wanted to make sure it wasn’t rushed, or a token requirement, stating, “If we don't actually believe in it, EMBRACE it, it's better not to engage in the politically-correct fraud of teaching it.” These comments further demonstrate that faculty do support diversity inclusion within their curriculum.

What currently exists

Faculty were also asked what courses currently exist to incorporate diversity into their curriculum. Most faculty, 92%, said that diversity was currently integrated in their curriculum. However, only 22% of faculty said that diversity was a requirement and, of those faculty who said it was required, 100% taught at a CSU. The faculty who said that diversity was not a requirement, but was still included, often said that “many of the criminal justice classes cover diversity” or that it was covered in different “chapters and discussions.” Overall, while diversity does appear to be valued among faculty, it is not incorporated in a dedicated way or method in most CSCU programs.

Antiracism- Mandating a course

Support for the inclusion of antiracist curriculum dropped dramatically when compared against diversity curriculum. Whereas 80% of faculty supported requiring diversity curriculum in the written comments,
only 41% of faculty supported requiring antiracist curriculum in the comments. The concern in regard to antiracist curriculum was evenly split among faculty who were unsure what exactly was meant by “antiracist” and those who did not support the concept, regardless of the definition used. For those who were concerned about the definition, some faculty said their support depended how the term was defined, while others said they were unsure of what the term “antiracist” actually meant. Any systemwide recommendation regarding “antiracism” should take into account these concerns. Finally, roughly 30% of respondents did not support requiring antiracist curriculum. Their reasons varied between those who felt the work was important, but shouldn’t be required, to others who felt the curriculum should be incorporated into multiple classes, not just one. In the end, only three faculty actually felt the requirement was a bad idea, stating that it might “cause more problems than it solves.”

**What currently exists**

Unlike diversity courses, where 22% of faculty said they are required in their programs, no faculty could point to required antiracism courses as part of their curriculum. The closest thing was one faculty member who answered, “I believe they do,” when asked if their program required antiracist curriculum, but could not point to any specifics. However, many faculty felt that “antiracism” was included in some form within the curriculum already (e.g. as part of other courses). In fact, 71% of faculty indicated that antiracism education was already found in hiring, class discussions, or general anti-bias training. Finally, only 29% of the written comments indicated that antiracism did not exist in any form within their programs.

**Conclusions**

Overall, faculty were generally supportive of diversity and antiracism courses within their programs. Most saw these issues as important and needing to be addressed—similar to students. However, faculty had several concerns about the inclusion of such courses, including wanting to know how the concepts would be defined, how academic freedom would be maintained, and whether this would be meaningful reform, and not a token effort. Addressing these concerns will be necessary in order to get meaningful buy-in from the faculty.
Student Survey Results*
2021

Overview

The CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force was formed on August 20, 2020, by the Connecticut Board of Regents, under the direction of the system provost and Interim president, Dr. Jane Gates. Dr. Gates appointed Drs. Tuesday Cooper (Manchester Community College) and William Lugo (Eastern Connecticut State University) to co-chair the task force. The charge of the group was to “identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU.” On October 30, 2020, the task force met for the first time and decided that in order to complete their charge, they required further data from CSCU students. On February 22, 2021, the student survey was submitted for IRB approval and on March 17, 2021, it received approval from Eastern Connecticut State University’s Committee on the Use of Human Subjects (IRB Protocol #2110). The survey was administered from March 22, 2021, through April 23, 2021. In total, 1,399 students from 10 institutions participated in the survey. These included two CSUs (Eastern Connecticut State University and Western Connecticut State University), seven community colleges (Gateway, Housatonic, Middlesex, Naugatuck, Norwalk, Quinebaug Valley, and Tunxis), and Charter Oak.

*This survey was made possible with a grant from the Davis Educational Foundation, which was established by Stanton and Elisabeth Davis after Mr. Davis’s retirement as chairman of Shaw’s Supermarkets, Inc.
Summary

Introduction

The survey results showed a diverse respondent group, with roughly 2/3 of respondents being female and just over half of all respondents (51%) 21 years old and younger (see Table 1). While a majority of respondents were white, almost half of those who self-disclosed their race/ethnicity were students of color (42%). The racial and ethnic breakdown of respondents was almost identical to that of the CSCU system as a whole. Over 2/3 of students were full-time and roughly half were from CSCU community colleges, 43% from CSUs and 7% from Charter Oak. The vast majority of students received financial aid (78%) and over 51% of students’ parents received a higher education degree (either their associate’s or bachelor’s).

Table 1. Youth Who Were Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>1,399</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn. State Universities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Oak</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity and Antiracism

One of the main goals of the task force is to look at issues of diversity and antiracism within criminal justice education in the CSCU system. When students were asked about diversity and antiracism education within their majors and institutions, there was significant buy-in from students in the need for required diversity and antiracism curriculum. In fact, over ¾ of all students, CJ students and students of color believed their schools should have an antiracist focus. Nearly 80% of CJ majors also believed that their major should have an antiracist focus and almost ¾ believed it should have a diversity course requirement. These are positive signs should programs, institutions, or the system decide to implement either a diversity or antiracist focus. Students were less sure when it came to representation on campus for students and faculty of color. Less than half of students agreed or strongly agreed that faculty of color were adequately represented in their programs- this held true for CJ students and students of color. Just over half felt the same way when it came to faculty of color at their institutions (i.e. students believed that faculty of color were better represented at their institutions than within their own individual programs). Students responded that there was better representation of students of color across their programs and at their institutions, whether they were white or nonwhite. Most students also believed their programs and institutions were welcoming to students of color (over 75%). Finally, students of color had almost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Diversity and Antiracism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(% agree or strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My major should have a diversity course requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My major should have an antiracist focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college should have a diversity course requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college should have an antiracist focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My major has an adequate amount of faculty of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My major has an adequate amount of students of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an adequate amount of faculty of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an adequate amount of students of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My major is a welcoming environment for students of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college is a welcoming environment for students of color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identical responses to majority students when it came to reporting welcoming environments in their majors and campuses. This is very positive news and institutions should feel encouraged at these results. These data could be used as a springboard to build off of when trying to maintain, and design more, inclusive environments on their campuses or when looking to incorporate diversity and antiracist curriculum into programs.

**School Resources**

As expected, students were enthusiastic about greater resources from their institutions when it came to supporting their success. In particular, students were most enthusiastic about *faculty mentors* and *paid internships*. For CJ majors, *faculty mentors* were viewed as the most needed resource for college success. For students of color, it was *money for textbooks*, followed by *faculty mentors* as the most popular resources leading to college success. However, if one only looks at students who answered “definitely” to the previous question, *money for textbooks* was the most common answer from students- whether they were all majors, CJ majors, or students of color. When it came to students who have had internships, CJ majors were the most likely to report that their schools were “extremely” or “very helpful” in getting them internships. Students of color were less likely to report their schools were “extremely” or “very helpful” in getting them internships. Interestingly, some students are already reporting that their internships are paid (n=84), although CJ majors were less likely to have paid internships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. School Resources</th>
<th>All majors %</th>
<th>CJ majors %</th>
<th>Students of Color %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the following resources be helpful in your college success?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Peer Mentors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Faculty Mentors</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Paid Internships</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. More financial aid</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Money for textbooks</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Free laptop</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you previously had an internship?</strong></td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How helpful was school in getting internship?</strong></td>
<td>(extremely or very helpful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was internship paid?</strong></td>
<td>(Yes - of those who had previously had an internship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internships

The most common barriers for student internships were the internship schedule and its location. The next greatest barrier, expressed by over half of all majors and students of color, was whether or not the internship was paid. This is not surprising as most internships require over 100 hours per semester from students (sometimes the requirement is over 200 hours). Due to many students’ family and work obligations (also listed in the survey as significant barriers), this is not a possibility. The most desirable time of day for all students to have an internship was the afternoon, from 12 pm – 4 pm. Programs should assess whether their current internship opportunities align with these needs, in particular for students of color, as they were significantly more likely to be impacted by schedule conflicts, citizenship requirements, and criminal histories (p<.01). Finally, students of color report that their institutions were less helpful in securing internships (only 39%) and also report the least satisfaction with the internship experiences when compared against other students. Given that achieving equity for students of color is a goal of the CSCU system, and that internships are high impact practices that are more likely to lead to greater retention and graduation rates, further examination of the internship experiences and opportunities is warranted- possibly with the goal of expanding such opportunities for students of color and taking into account their unique situations which could be perpetuating systemic inequities.

Table 4. Internships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All majors %</th>
<th>CJ majors %</th>
<th>Students of Color %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you had to find an internship,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would these barriers prevent you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from getting it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. If it was unpaid</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. If it was partially paid</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Location</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Internship schedule</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Family obligations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Criminal history</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Citizenship status</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Current employment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(% answered Probably or Definitely)

Internship desirability...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All majors %</th>
<th>CJ majors %</th>
<th>Students of Color %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Morning 7-11 am</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Afternoon 12-4 pm</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Evening 5-9 pm</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Weekends</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(% Very desirable or desirable)

Rate your internship experience (mean score 1-5)

4.11  4.33  3.98
Law Enforcement

Over one quarter of all students, and one third of students of color, have considered a career in law enforcement. This is a tremendous opportunity for our campuses, particularly when coupled with the fact that over 20% of upperclassmen students (and almost 1/3 for students of color), regretted their major choice (see Table 6). This would amount to literally tens of thousands of students within our system. The most common response as to why students might not choose to become a CJ major was the “public’s negative image of police,” followed by the “aggressive male culture.” The least common responses were regarding pay and work schedule. For those students who have previously worked in law enforcement and are returning to school, the most common reason was the desire to “further my education.”

Table 5. Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you considered a career in law enforcement? (% who answered yes)</th>
<th>All majors %</th>
<th>CJ majors %</th>
<th>Students of Color %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you considered a career in law enforcement? (% who answered yes)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact issues have on student’s willingness to major in CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Public’s negative image of police</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Aggressive male culture in police</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Not strong enough physically</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Job is too stressful</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Not interested</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. It doesn’t pay enough</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Work schedule</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. People like me are not reflected in job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. No respect for police</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you currently work in, or previously worked in, CJ? (% who answered yes)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you plan on doing with your degree?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Pay raise/promotion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change careers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Job security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Want to further my education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(only students who work, or have worked, in CJ, in %)
Other Questions

Most students believe their programs did a good job at preparing them to be successful. However, less than 1/3 of all students, and students of color, reported they were aware that life experiences could be turned into credits. This is a lost opportunity to recruit, retain, and graduate students on time. Finally, as mentioned previously, 20% of all students who are graduating regret their major choice. The number was much higher for students of color, where 29% of students reportedly would change their major “knowing what they know now.” The solution to this problem requires more data, but perhaps a greater investment in advising is warranted— in particular in faculty mentors, which students view as a pathway for greater success. Could institutions offer greater incentives towards faculty to be mentors?

Table 6. Other questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All majors %</th>
<th>CJ majors %</th>
<th>Students of Color %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate your program’s resources at helping you be successful.............. (Average rating out of 5)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% aware that life experiences can be turned into credits ( % who answered yes)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing what you know now, would you change majors?</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Math and Science</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Humanities/Social Science</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Professional Studies</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Conn. State University</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Community College</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Charter Oak</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% upperclassmen “Yes”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

This survey was conducted less than one year after the death of George Floyd and a summer of protests against racial injustice across the country. While results show that students of all majors and demographics support greater diversity and antiracism efforts from their institutions, this data should be collected every 2-3 years to gauge student buy-in for these issues. For now, the data is encouraging, should CSCU decide to shift resources to further pursue diversity and antiracism efforts. For example, paid internships, faculty mentor programs, and greater awareness of life experience credits are a few possibilities that have shown promise elsewhere and are supported by this survey data.
Overview*

The CSCU Criminal Justice Task Force was formed on August 20, 2020, by the Connecticut Board of Regents, under the direction of the system provost, Dr. Jane Gates. Dr. Gates appointed Drs. Tuesday Cooper (Manchester Community College) and William Lugo (Eastern Connecticut State University) to co-chair the task force. The charge of the group was to “identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues of racism as well as policies and practices which impact the status and advancement of criminal justice studies in CSCU.” On March 30, 2021, the task force co-chairs met with other task force members who serve, or have served in the past, as members of law enforcement. It was unanimously decided in this meeting that, in order to complete the charge given to the task force, they required further data from members of law enforcement- in particular new police recruits and the officers who train them. On April 28, 2021, the survey was submitted for IRB approval and on May 2, 2021, it received approval from Eastern Connecticut State University’s Committee on the Use of Human Subjects (IRB Protocol #2114). The survey was administered from May 3, 2021, through May 15, 2021. In total, 39 police trainers and 107 police recruits participated in the survey.

*This survey was made possible with a grant from the Davis Educational Foundation, which was established by Stanton and Elisabeth Davis after Mr. Davis’s retirement as chairman of Shaw’s Supermarkets, Inc.
Summary

Introduction

Table 1 shows the demographics of both trainers and recruits. In terms of gender, both trainers (89%) and recruits (73%) were overwhelmingly male—although trainers were slightly more so. As expected, recruits were significantly younger, with most falling into the 18-29 age group, while the average age of trainers was 40-49. The racial and ethnic makeup of the recruits was similar to that of the rest of Connecticut. The state makeup, according to the 2020 US Census, is 66% White, 12% Black, 17% Hispanic, 5% Asian, 3% mixed race, and .6% Native American. The recruits were 67% White, 10% Black, 14% Hispanic, 5% Asian, 4% Bi-or multi-racial, and 0% Native American. This is good news for the police when trying to ensure their officers are reflecting the communities they serve. The trainers were less diverse, both in terms of gender and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Law Enforcement Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Racial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Tech School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What county do you/will you work in?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
race/ethnicity. The most common degree for recruits was a bachelor’s degree (57%), which was similar to trainers where both bachelor’s and graduate degrees were the most common (31% for both).

**Skillsets of Incoming Recruits**

When asked to rate the emotional, communication, and soft skills of themselves, or of all incoming recruits (for trainers), there were stark differences between recruits and trainers. Recruits tended to rate themselves very highly among all skillsets, with more than 80% of all recruits believing they were “excellent” or “good” in every skill category. Trainers did not have the same perception. In fact, for several skillsets, less than 40% of trainers gave recruits “excellent” or “good” marks- in the skills “Managing own anxiety,” “Giving clear communication,” “Being confident under stress,” and “Using positive nonverbal communication.” These findings are problematic because recruits already perceive they are strong in these categories, differing by more than 50% in some cases from those of instructors. For example, while 82% of recruits believed they were “excellent” or “good” at “using positive nonverbal communication,” only 26% of trainers made the same claim- a difference of 56%! These large differences persisted throughout the entire category of “Communication Skills.” Large differences also existed under “Managing Own Anxiety,” where 80% of incoming recruits felt they were “excellent” or “good” at this skill, compared to only 36% of trainers who felt the same. Under “Critical thinking,” 90% of recruits felt they were “excellent” or “good,” compared to only 42% of trainers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Rating Skills of Incoming Recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who answered “excellent” or “good”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing respect to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving clear communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being confident under stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using positive nonverbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in active listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Soft Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-escalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ethical standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Resources

There was much more agreement between recruits and trainers in their ability to engage with the public. In fact, new recruits were less confident than instructors in most of these categories. The largest difference was in “Persons with disabilities,” where 95% of trainers felt recruits were either “very” or “somewhat” prepared to engage with them (compared to only 72% of recruits who felt the same). Overall, trainers overwhelmingly felt recruits were ready to engage with a variety of different community members. The two groups that trainers felt recruits were most prepared to engage with were “The elderly” and a “Racial or ethnic minority” (note: these were also the same two groups recruits felt the most prepared to engage with).

General Skills

When it came to overall satisfaction of recruits’ skills in categories, both recruits and trainers were mostly satisfied with skills, with one exception- “Emotional skills.” While 99% of recruits were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their emotional skills, only 11% of trainers could say the same. Perhaps this relates back to trainers’ concerns over recruits’ abilities to manage their own anxiety. Or perhaps trainers have further concerns about recruits’ abilities to manage their emotions, besides the five emotional skills mentioned in this survey. Future surveys could delve deeper into this concern.
Policing and Education

When trainers were asked about an officers’ ability to succeed based on education, there was a clear correlation between the two variables. While only 58% of trainers felt that officers with a high school diploma had an “excellent” or “good” chance to succeed, that number increased to almost 90% for officers with a bachelor’s degree (89%) and 72% for those with an associate degree. Further investigation is warranted to determine what skills might lead to this potential greater success, and to ascertain whether it is causally related (e.g., could the difference be related to age, as recruits with a bachelor’s degree would be older than those with a high school diploma?)

Recruit Comparison

When trainers were asked about how recruits today compared to recruits from ten years ago, there was only one category where they felt the majority of recruits today improved upon—“Community engagement.” This is a little surprising, considering trainers simultaneously felt recruits today needed improvement in their communication skills. For example, only 36% of trainers believed recruits today were “significantly” or “slightly more” skilled than previous recruits when it came to communication skills. A similar sentiment was expressed in critical thinking skills, where only 39% of trainers believed today’s recruits were “significantly” or “slightly more” skilled than previous recruits. Trainers were evenly split when it came to emotional skills, with 50% saying recruits today were “significantly” or “slightly more” skilled than previous recruits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Police Success and Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to succeed with current degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who answered “excellent” or “good”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Recruit Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who answered “significantly” or “slightly more” skilled than recruits 10 years ago in…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open ended comments- summary

Trainers

Trainers had many positive things to say about new recruits when it came to their strengths, with the most common sentiment focusing on technology. As one trainer put it, “they (recruits) have a high degree of technology and social media experience.” When it came to weaknesses, overwhelmingly trainers focused on communication skills, with one instructor phrasing it as “stunted interpersonal skills.” Over 1/3 of the comments focused on the poor communication skills of incoming recruits. The next most common concern focused on recruits coming in with unrealistic expectations of what the job was going to be like. Similarly, when trainers were asked to comment on how institutions of higher education could help students, the number one answer was helping them get a more realistic picture of what the job was going to entail–which some said could come through the classroom or “internships and real-life experiences.” The purpose, as one officer put it, would be “to understand the challenges they will encounter in their career.” The second most helpful thing colleges could do was offer more courses in communication and writing to criminal justice students, both to help new officers with “face to face communication” as well as the ability to “communicate in writing.” Finally, when asked about problems facing the profession, many officers pointed out the difficulty in finding qualified candidates. Some pointed the blame on reduced standards, and many on the negative press the profession has been receiving.

Recruits

Interestingly, when recruits were asked what their biggest strength was, the number one answer, by far, was “communication skills.” This is surprising, because it was listed as the number one weakness by instructors. It would be interesting to investigate how this dynamic affects instruction. For example, are recruits less likely to be influenced by instruction on a topic they feel they already excel at? Are instructors aware that this gap exists? The next biggest strength recruits listed was their life experiences. Also surprisingly, this was the next biggest concern brought up by trainers. When it came to weaknesses, recruits overwhelmingly focused on procedure and knowledge of the criminal statutes. The second biggest weakness expressed by recruits was a mix of their ability to handle the stress of the job, self-confidence, and their physical fitness. When asked about the biggest challenges facing the profession,
recruits, like trainers, were concerned about the negative press officers have been receiving and its effects on community-police relations, on police morale, and on the future of policing in general.

Conclusions

Two things are clear from the results of this survey. First, while it might seem predictable for recruits to be overconfident about their skills, and perhaps instructors to be overly critical, it was surprising how far apart these two groups were in their assessments. In fact, they could not have been farther apart. While trainers were most concerned about recruits’ communication skills, recruits were most confident about their communication skills. Also, when given the opportunity to discuss their greatest strength in detail, communication skills were mentioned the most by recruits. Second, given these findings, this survey assessment should be expanded to dig deeper into the concerns brought up by trainers, as well as a detailed assessment by recruits regarding their training in school and at the academy. Perhaps a stronger partnership could/should exist between the academy, police departments and institutions of higher education. Such a partnership could be beneficial for police training, especially in areas of societal concern today, like communication and community engagement.
Appendix C: Resources of Model Institutions

Bentley University

https://www.bentley.edu/offices/diversity-inclusion/racial-justice

Bentley University has a public statement about its commitment to being an antiracist institution. It is not program specific, instead it is a collective effort on the part of all departments to engage in said activities. To this end, a task force was created, a plan of action was made, and the task force regularly reports out of the work and progress. https://www.bentley.edu/racial-justice-discovery-document. The work, housed under Diversity & Inclusion, includes a Toolkit, a workplan for actions to be taken beyond the task force, and a set of articulated aspirations to move toward antiracism. The website has a great example of a “Inclusive Excellence” dashboard which helps to inform visitors statistics regarding student and faculty demographics, diversity intensive courses, graduation and retention rates, etc.

Boise State University

https://www.boisestate.edu/sps-criminaljustice/antiracism-statement/

Boise State University’s Criminal Justice Program has a statement on its department’s landing page which identifies its position on antiracism. It acknowledges the current state of racism in the U.S., its responsibility to the students and community to help dismantle system racism and its intention to be antiracist. It provides a brief plan of action for the fall 2021 in terms of engaging stakeholders and setting a programmatic and research agenda.

Fitchburg State University – Antiracism Resources

https://fitchburgstate.libguides.com/c.php?g=1046516&p=7738612

This website is part of the Amelia V. Gallucci-Cririo Library services and serves as a library guide (“Lib Guide”) for students and faculty wishing to conduct research in criminal justice, or learn more about related topics (which are identified as well). There are a host of videos and links to electronic sources. This is part of a larger offering by the library of “Antiracism Resources” which are made available as “a starting point for members of the Fitchburg State University Community seeking information and
resources to learn about antiracism, white privilege, and inclusion.”
https://fitchburgstate.libguides.com/c.php?g=1046516&p=7611610

As a public facing demonstration of the University’s commitment, Fitchburg’s president also has a statement posted online which includes a context and plans for follow-up for their “Courageous Conversations” initiatives, part of a larger university-wide initiative to create an environment that is equitable for the FSU community.

https://www.fitchburgstate.edu/about/news/followup-courageous-conversations

Georgetown University Library – Antiracism Toolkit
https://guides.library.georgetown.edu/c.php?g=1046869&p=8174353

This website provides another example of a Lib Guide which provides access to electronic resources (and links to printed resources) related to policing and race, the prison system in the U.S. and its ties to race, and information about current events such as the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020 (with a tracker for users to follow where the bill is in the legislative process). This website is housed within a larger website which provides resources for research in antiracism in various disciplines and topic areas (e.g., education, social justice, criminal justice, medicine, environmental racism, white privilege, etc.). https://guides.library.georgetown.edu/antiracism

Minnesota State – Leading the Way to Law Enforcement Education Reform
https://www.minnstate.edu/Equity2030/blog/articles/2021-0525.html

Through a collaborative effort between the Minnesota State College and University System, the Board of Trustees and Minnesota Department of Higher Education the Minnesota system is working to change criminal justice education upon recognizing that some 86% of graduates in law enforcement come from one of the state colleges and universities. This website is a public facing status report that documents efforts to be intentionally antiracists in its education and practices. Much like the Connecticut system, they created a task force to begin the initial work of investigating the status quo regarding programming, policies and practices. The task force, itself, has a landing page to document its work, intentions and progress. https://www.minnstate.edu/le/index.html These efforts are rooted in a larger system-wide effort to create equity within the system by 2030 (Minnesota State Equity 2030, https://www.minnstate.edu/Equity2030/index.html ).
Northeastern University, Institute on Race and Justice

https://cssh.northeastern.edu/irj/

This website serves as the home for the Institute of Race and Justice, a research initiative within the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. There is a public facing statement regarding its commitment to dismantling racism and inequities within the criminal justice system by conducting research to support its actions, partnering with communities, and taking action in its “hiring, training, promotion, and publishing practices.” https://cssh.northeastern.edu/irj/statement-on-racial-justice/. They include action plans for work to be done internally, within the community and with practitioners in their efforts to inform more equitable practices and policies.

The Institute works with a diverse advisory board, mostly non-academic community members who are working professionals and experts in the field of juvenile justice, community engagement, public health, health and human services and law enforcement. They meet monthly for program planning and to provide input and lead the direction of research inquiry.

Texas Southern University – Center for Justice Research

https://www.centerforjusticeresearch.org/blog/antiracism

This website supports the work of the Center for Justice Research which focuses on criminal justice reform. https://www.centerforjusticeresearch.org/ There is access to a plethora of research around the unjust and inequitable conditions within the criminal justice system and a public facing statement regarding their commitment to finding data driven solutions to combat racism and be intentionally antiracist in their research practices. The Center adopts a definition of antiracism and describes some of its efforts to integrate the practice into its thought processes, hiring practices and funding efforts. This serves as a hub for materials in an institute, not found within a library setting.

https://www.racialequitytools.org/resources/plan/issues/criminal-justice

University of California Berkeley School of Law – Racial Justice, What We’re Doing

https://www.law.berkeley.edu/racial-justice-2/

This website is specific to the efforts of the Berkeley School of Law and its efforts to dismantle systemic racism. There is a public facing statement, made by the dean of the law school, which acknowledges its responsibility in working to eradicate racism and
creating an environment that is actively antiracist. Also found on this site is an
acknowledgement of how the admissions and financial aid processes can be rooted in
antiracist practices. On this page, there is a statement which is a breakdown of the
following categories “Who we are,” “What we do,” and “What we must do better.”
This includes general information about programming, education efforts, and a
description of concepts and initiatives that they must improve upon. There are a host of
video resources, conversations by faculty and staff regarding related issue and student
statements and activities all tied to creating antiracist policies and practices. Lastly, the
Berkeley Library has provided a Lib Guide entitled “An Antiracists Reader” that
includes several resources, across discipline (and both electronic and printed materials)
to assist with antiracist research.

https://guides.lib.berkeley.edu/c.php?g=1047419&p=7605384

University of California Santa Cruz, Institute for Social Transformation – Antiracist
and Criminal Justice Reform Resources

https://transform.ucsc.edu/antiracism-resources/

This website serves as a hub for programs, research, courses related to Antiracists. In
addition, there is a statement by the Dean of the Social Sciences division affirming the
commitment to antiracism work. It is part of a larger framework for the Institute of
Social Transformation, a university-wide program which seeks to provide research
based solutions to contemporary problems. “We try to understand and transform the
underlying systemic causes of problems, rather than address only the most obvious
symptoms. This includes promoting systemic change in institutions and social
relationships, social norms and values, and relationships of power.”

https://transform.ucsc.edu/about/social-transformation/ The programs and
initiatives are not only specific to race, justice and antiracism within the field of criminal
justice. Instead, it is an interdisciplinary and cross-departmental approach to moving
forward the agenda of the university.

University of Nevada, Reno

https://www.unr.edu/criminal-justice

This website provides another example of a public facing statement regarding
antiracism. The Department of Criminal Justice issued a statement on Antiracism, its
position regarding it and its work around intentionally dismantling systemic racism.
They have connected their work to the larger, departmental initiatives around Diversity
Equity and Inclusion. The department also recognizes the interdisciplinary nature of their work. "The classroom content of criminal justice is interdisciplinary, drawing on theories developed in a variety of fields. Theories are derived from sociology and psychology regarding the causes of crime and delinquency. Law, political science and history provide information about the development of law and the applications of sanctions within the legal process." This is important because it recognizes the need for curriculum, and hence faculty, to be inclusive of voices from other disciplines (or who have the experience and background that is of an interdisciplinary nature).

Wheaton College

https://wheatoncollege.edu/academics/special-projects-initiatives/center-for-collaborative-teaching-and-learning/antiracist-educator/

Wheaton College has a website designed to educate its community on being antiracist. While not specific to criminal justice, it is another example of a college-wide initiative which is inclusive of definitions that have been adopted, resources and a public facing statement regarding its commitment to being an institution who sets an agenda to move toward antiracist practices.
Appendix D

Continuum on Becoming a Antiracist Multicultural Organization (Template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusive (Traditional) 1</th>
<th>Passive 2</th>
<th>Symbolic Change (Diversity) 3</th>
<th>Identity Change 4</th>
<th>Structural Change (Diversity Equity Inclusion - DEI) 5</th>
<th>Inclusive Antiracists Multicultural Organization in a Transformed Society 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monocultural Racial and Cultural Differences Seen as Deficits</td>
<td>Multicultural Tolerant of Racial and Cultural Differences</td>
<td>Antiracists</td>
<td>Antiracist/ Multicultural Racial and Cultural Differences Seen as Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Curriculum contains little to no references of Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC)</td>
<td>-Curriculum contains references of BIPOC in segregated areas (a week/section within a course)</td>
<td>-Focus on diversity in contained areas (Toolbox)</td>
<td>-System-wide professional development activities, e.g. Achieving the Dream (ATD)</td>
<td>-CJ Task Force -DEI workgroup</td>
<td>-Mission/iyion -Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Utilization of the same people from BIPOC groups serving on committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://philanos.org/Antiracist-O rganizations. This template is modeled after the Continuum on Becoming An Antiracist Multicultural Organization by Crossroads Ministry adapted from Drs. Bailey W. Jackson and Rita Hardiman.
ITEM
The Board of Regents for Higher Education resolves to adopt a policy regarding Students Athlete’s Name, Image and Likeness.

BACKGROUND
The Connecticut General Assembly enacted Public Act (Spec. Sess.) 21-132, section 160 which requires governing boards of institutions of higher education to adopt policies enabling student athletes to be compensated for their use of their name, image and likeness. The Act allows student-athletes the opportunity to earn compensation through an endorsement contracts as well as employment in activities unrelated to their participation in intercollegiate programs. The Act further allows student athletes the ability to obtain legal or professional representation through a written agreement. However, the exercise of these rights must comply with the Board’s policy and the applicable law. Although the Act impacts institutions of higher education, only the State Universities are affected by the Act as they are the only institutions within our system that participate in intercollegiate athletic programs. These policies must be in effect prior to January 1, 2022.

ANALYSIS
The Act is very prescriptive as to the contents of the policy to be enacted by governing boards. Specifically, the Act requires that each policy must include provisions that: (1) Require a student athlete to disclose and submit a copy to their University of each endorsement contract, written agreement for employment and representation agreement executed by the student athlete; (2) Prohibit a student athlete from entering into an agreement that conflicts with the provisions of any agreement to which the University is a party, provided such institution shall disclose to the student athlete or the student athlete's attorney or sports agent the provisions of the agreement that are in conflict; (3) Prohibit a student athlete from using or consenting to the use of any institutional marks during such student athlete's performance of the endorsement contract or employment activity; (4) Prohibit a student athlete's performance of the endorsement contract or employment activity from interfering with any official team activities or academic obligations; and (5) Identify any prohibited endorsements.

Institutions cannot prohibit or prevent prohibit student athletes from earning compensation from such endorsement contract or employment activity nor can they prohibit or prevent representation by a duly licensed attorney or sports agent. Institutions may not restrict or revoke student athletes’ eligibility for scholarships or participation in the intercollegiate athletic program at such institution. Moreover, student athletes may not receive compensation for use of such student athlete's name, image or likeness as an inducement to attend, enroll in or continue attending a specific institution of higher education or intercollegiate athletic program.

The attached policy statement has been reviewed by appropriate officials at each of the CSUs and is in alignment with other institutions within the State.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the resolution to adopt the Policy regarding Student Athletes’ Name, Image and Likeness.
CT BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

RESOLUTION

concerning

Student Athlete’s Name, Image and Likeness

October 21, 2021

WHEREAS,  The Connecticut General Assembly enacted Public Act (Special Session) 21-132, section 160 thereof requires that governing boards of institutions of higher education adopt policies to comply with the Act’s requirements regarding student athletes’ name, image and likeness prior to January 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS,  The Act is applicable to student athletes who attend the Connecticut State Universities athletic programs; therefore, be resolved

RESOLVED,  That the Board of Regents adopts a Policy for Student Athlete’s Name, Image and Likeness.

A True Copy:

______________________________________

Alice Pritchard, Secretary of the
CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Regarding

STUDENT ATHLETE’S NAME, IMAGE AND LIKENESS

Purpose Statement

To establish rules consistent with Connecticut Public Act 21-132 (Spec. Sess. section 160) pursuant to which Connecticut State University System student-athletes are permitted to (1) earn compensation through an endorsement contract or employment in an activity unrelated to an intercollegiate athletic program; and (2) obtain legal or professional representation of an attorney or sports agent through a written agreement, provided that in each case, the student-athlete complies with the terms and conditions of these rules and applicable law.

APPLIES TO
All student-athletes and State University Employees.

DEFINITIONS

Compensation means the receipt, whether directly or indirectly, of any cryptocurrency, money, goods, services, other items of value, in kind contributions and any other form of payment or remuneration.

Endorsement contract means a written agreement under which a student-athlete is employed or receives compensation for the use by another party of such student-athlete's person, name, image or likeness in the promotion of any product, service or event.

Institution of higher education means an institution of higher education, as defined in section 10a-55 of the general statutes, and a for profit institution of higher education licensed to operate in this state.

Institutional marks means the name, logo, trademarks, mascot, unique colors, copyrights and other defining insignia of the University.

Intercollegiate athletic program means a program at the University for sports played at the collegiate level for which eligibility requirements for participation by a student-athlete are established by a national association for the promotion or regulation of college athletics.

NCAA means the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Official team activities means all games, practices, exhibitions, scrimmages, team appearances, team photograph sessions, sports camps sponsored by the University and other team-organized activities, including, but not limited to, photograph sessions, news media interviews, and other related activities as specified by the University.

Prohibited endorsements means receipt of compensation by, or employment of, a student-athlete for use of the student-athlete's person, name, image or likeness (“NIL”) in association with any product, category of companies, brands, or types of endorsement contracts that are: (1) prohibited by law; (2) prohibited by these rules; or (3) prohibited under the applicable University procedures adopted in accordance with these rules.

Sports agent means a duly licensed person who negotiates or solicits a contract on behalf of a student-athlete in accordance with the Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act, 15 USC 7801, et seq., as amended from time to time.
**Student-athlete** means a student enrolled at the University who participates in an intercollegiate athletic program.

**POLICY STATEMENT**

The University shall permit its student-athletes to (1) earn compensation through an endorsement contract or employment in an activity unrelated to an intercollegiate athletic program and (2) obtain legal or professional representation of an attorney or sports agent through a written agreement, provided that the student-athlete complies with these rules and applicable law.

I. **Agreements for Representation by a Sports Agent or an Attorney**
   a. A student-athlete may only enter into an agreement for representation with a sports agent if the student-athlete submits a copy of the agreement to the University.
   b. A student-athlete may only enter into an agreement for representation with an attorney if the student-athlete submits a copy of the agreement to the University.

II. **Endorsement Contracts and Agreements for Employment Activities**
    A student-athlete may only enter into an endorsement contract or agreement for other employment activities if:
    a. the student-athlete discloses the existence of the agreement to the University;
    b. the student-athlete submits a copy of the agreement to the University prior to the student-athlete performing any activity or service under the agreement;
    c. the agreement, or any portion thereof, does not conflict with the provisions of any agreement to which the University is a party. In the event that a potential conflict is identified, the University shall disclose to the student-athlete or the student-athlete's attorney or sports agent the provisions of the University agreement that are in conflict; and
    d. the agreement does not require the student-athlete to participate or engage in any activity prohibited by Section III of these rules.

III. **Prohibitions**
    a. Student-athletes are prohibited from using or consenting to the use of any University marks when performing any services or activity associated with an endorsement contract or employment activity.
    b. Student-athletes are prohibited from performing any service or activity associated with an endorsement contract or employment activity that interferes with any official team activities or academic obligations.
    c. University staff members are prohibited from creating or facilitating endorsement contracts for a student-athlete or providing compensation themselves to a student-athlete.
    d. University employees and students are prohibited from creating or facilitating NIL compensation opportunities for prospective student-athletes as a recruiting inducement or current student-athlete as an inducement to remain enrolled at the University.
    e. Student-athletes are prohibited from receiving compensation from, entering into an endorsement contract with, and/or otherwise engaging in an employment activity with companies, brands, products, conduct, and/or entertainment prohibited under University procedures adopted in accordance with these rules.

IV. **Prohibited endorsements**
    a. A tobacco company or brand, including any tobacco product, alternative nicotine product, electronic nicotine delivery system, or any electronic nicotine delivery system retailer, or any specialty retailer of electronic nicotine delivery systems or tobacco specialty store.
b. Any alcoholic beverage company or brand.
c. Any marijuana company, product, or brand.
d. Any seller or dispensary of a controlled substance, as defined by federal law.
e. Any adult entertainment, sexually suggestive products, or sex-oriented products, services, conduct, imagery, or inferences.
f. Any product, substance, or method that is prohibited in competition by an athletic association, athletic conference, or other organization governing intercollegiate athletic program competition.
g. Any casino or entities that conduct, provide data or information to, sponsor, or promote gambling activities.

V. Procedures
The University President or the President’s designee may adopt procedures concerning the implementation of these rules.

ENFORCEMENT
Violations of these rules may result in appropriate disciplinary measures in accordance with state law, University Laws and By-Laws, and Division of Athletics Student Athlete Handbook.
WHEREAS, The Board of Regents for Higher Education voted unanimously on March 9, 2018, to submit a Substantive Change request to the New England Commission of Higher Education (formerly NEASC), seeking its approval for the merger of the 12 individually accredited regional community technical colleges into a single accredited college; and

WHEREAS, On May 14, 2020 the Board resolved that the single accredited college will be named Connecticut State Community College (“CT State”); and

WHEREAS, In order for CT State to provide funding to students without any disruption, under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, the United States Department of Education requires CT State to be identified with an existing Office of Postsecondary Education Identification (“OPEID”) number from an existing college within the Connecticut State Colleges & Universities system; and

WHEREAS, In order to file the application with the United States Department of Education to provide Title IV funds, the Board must resolve to select one College to carry the OPEID number while the current remaining 11 colleges (including their additional locations) will become additional campuses and locations under the parent OPEID; therefore be it

RESOLVED, The Board of Regents selects Capital Community College’s OPEID number as the OPEID for CT State while the current remaining 11 colleges (including their additional locations) will become additional campuses and locations under the parent CT State OPEID; and be it further

RESOLVED, The CT State OPEID number shall be used for the merger application with the United States Department of Education.
ITEM
This proposal seeks to establish the selection of an Office of Postsecondary Identification (OPEID) number from within our twelve community colleges for the purposes of future recognition by the United States Department of Education. Tangential yet equally critical, this selection is necessary in preparation for Connecticut State Community College's single participation in the Title IV programs of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

BACKGROUND
In April 2017, the organizational consolidation of the CSCU community colleges began under the Students First plan. In May 2020, the Board of Regents adopted the name of our merged institution as Connecticut State Community College. Up to date information regarding the consolidation with the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE) is available within CSCU's Progress Report in June 2021 and corresponding NECHE reply in July 2021.

Purpose and Next Steps
At this stage, it is prudent to take an active step in planning the consolidation with regard to the student financial assistance programs within Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, in order for Connecticut State Community College to provide the requisite access to financial assistance for its student population without interruption.

Title IV assistance continues to be a critical component of our enrollment management division, both at present and in preparation for participation as Connecticut State Community College. For the most recently completed 2020-21 award year, our colleges had disbursed a total of $69.2 million in Title IV funding, which includes $57.8 million in Federal Pell Grants to more than 18,300 students. Our colleges additionally participate in the Campus-Based aid programs (Federal Work-Study and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant programs), as well as the Federal Direct Loan program.

Leveraging a partnership with Blue Icon Advisors, LLC (a wholly owned subsidiary of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators) and the Lumina Foundation, a common Policies and Procedures manual was developed for use in the 2021-22 academic for all community college financial aid offices. Complete with staff training and a student-facing financial aid handbook, progress has been made toward commonality within its community college financial aid offices that will promote access, equality, and an atmosphere of compliance well in advance of the consolidation.

CSCU/CT State will be required to submit an application for the merger of our twelve individual community colleges into a single institution with the US Department of Education. The intended application submission date is July 1, 2022 with a target completion date of July 1, 2023. This timeline is at the recommendation of our Boston/New York School Participation Division that will handle the merger with CSCU/CT State. At the suggestion of the Boston/New York School Participation Division, we will start the pre-submission activities in the Spring of 2022.

In advance of this application, the BOR now makes the selection of an OPEID from within our individual institutions. Under the merger application with the US Department of Education, the name associated with the selected OPEID must reflect “Connecticut State Community College” in name. Under CT State, the OPEID structure will operate under a “parent/child relationship,” where the selected OPEID (or parent) will bear the name of Connecticut State Community College, and each of the other institutions (including all current campuses and additional locations) will be restructured as a location (or child) of
the selected OPEID. Importantly, this decision will not adversely impact any college’s current Title IV eligibility or financial aid operations prior to the merger being completed in 2023.

Of note, CSCU has been verbally advised of the inability to request a new OPEID since Connecticut State Community College is merging active institutions and not creating a new institution. This timeline additionally reflects planning for students to be able to identify Connecticut State Community College on the 2023-2024 Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) that becomes publicly available on October 1, 2022.

RECOMMENDATION
To complete this preparatory step for our application of merger with the US Department of Education that shall consolidate CSCU’s twelve community colleges into a single community college, this committee recommends that the Board of Regents select the OPEID associated with Capital Community College (007635-00). This OPEID shall be identified as the “parent” identification for Connecticut State Community College, with a corresponding name change from “Capital Community College” to “Connecticut State Community College” and a designation as the “Capital” Campus. All other campuses and locations must convert into additional campuses and locations within Connecticut State Community College. Any further updates to the selection and use of this OPEID shall be at the discretion of the US Department of Education for the purpose of establishing Title IV eligibility for Connecticut State Community College.

10/07/2021 – BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee
10/21/2021 – Board of Regents
CSCU Accessibility
What is Accessibility

- Accessibility is the removal of systematic barriers including policies, procedures, or practices that unfairly discriminate and can prevent individuals from participating fully in a situation. Systemic barriers are often put into place unintentionally.

- Digital materials must be designed and developed so that people with all abilities can use them.

- To accommodate various impairments, digital content must be accessible with assistive technologies and meet minimum accessibility criteria pursuant to the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level AA, at a minimum.

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) at the U.S. Department of Education defines accessibility as meaning “when a person with a disability is afforded the opportunity to acquire the same information, engage in the same interactions, and enjoy the same services as a person without a disability in an equally integrated and equally effective manner, with substantially equivalent ease of use.”
## Higher Education Accessibility and the Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act</strong></th>
<th><strong>Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (Revised 1998)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1973)</td>
<td>(1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a civil rights law of non-discrimination under federal grants and programs which mandates that accommodations be provided to students with disabilities.</td>
<td>• is civil rights legislation governed by the Department of Justice. The goal of the law is to ensure equal access and opportunity of individuals with disabilities to programs, services, and activities.</td>
<td>• enacted to eliminate barriers in information technology, to make available new opportunities for people with disabilities, and to encourage development of technologies that will help achieve these goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSCU Digital Accessibility Policy

The **CSCU Accessibility Policy** was enacted in **October 2020** and requires all CSCU institutions to take actions that include the following:

- Recognize EIT Accessibility as the responsibility of all administrators, faculty, and staff.
- Develop, purchase, host, and/or acquire, to the extent feasible, content (instructional, promotional, media, etc.), web pages, websites, hardware, and software products and services that are accessible to individuals with disabilities.
- Develop an Accessibility Implementation Plan to promote ongoing, inclusive access for individuals with disabilities.
CSCU Digital Accessibility Policy Creation

- Created through the systemwide **CSCU Accessibility Advisory Council**
  - over 40 members representing all 17 institutions

- Council sub-committee drafted the policy
  - included faculty, staff and administrators as well as individuals with disabilities

- Vetting Process
  - 40+ member council
  - Connected constituent groups (such as the Council of Disability Directors and Council of Library Directors).
  - An opportunity for institutional feedback was presented and all feedback received was evaluated for inclusion.
  - CSCU Legal Affairs
CSCU Digital Accessibility Policy Rationale

Federal accessibility requirements - ADA, Section 504 and Section 508

- Institutions must ensure equal access.
- Institutions have a continuing obligation to provide access that need not be triggered by an individual’s specific request for an accommodation.
- Institutions must focus on the pertinent technology-based services, activities, and information, such as official websites, learning management systems, online programs and activities, student portals, e-mail systems, registration services, calendar events, etc.

While ADA, Section 504, and Section 508 are in force federally, CSCU did not have any policy or procedures in place to guide faculty, staff and administrators in creating accessible digital learning experiences.

The policy and standards are based on national best practices and lessons learned from institutions cited/settlements and are aligned with system goals of equity and inclusion.
CSCU Annual Accessibility Status Report Requirement

- **Purpose:** provide better transparency of policy compliance efforts as well as identify common barriers that can be addressed collaboratively.

- **Year Zero report covered October 2020 through August 31, 2021**
  - Updates on any progress made through August 31st, 2021 in support of the policy’s implementation as well as any challenges faced. This status report does not need to address the proposed milestone presented in the guidance document.

- **Year One began September 1, 2021**
The vast majority of students with disabilities don’t get a college degree.

Fewer than 35 percent of students with disabilities who enroll in a four-year college or university graduate within eight years.

NCES Report Shines Light on One of the Largest Equity Gaps in Education

June 5, 2017
By: Nycole Stawinoga, Program Manager, Research & Communications
Higher Education Landscape

- Increasing number of individuals with disabilities
  - 26% national average
  - 22% in Connecticut

- Increasing number of adults attending college

- Increasing use of digital delivery formats for learning
  - COVID-19 Impact
  - Expansion of Online Degree Programs

- Less than 10% of college students w/disabilities are disclosing/seeking assistance
  - Generally, 4-5% of students disclose

- 41% of community college students w/disabilities take at least 8 years to complete degree

- Only 1 in 3 students w/disabilities graduate from 4-year institutions
  - Comparatively, high school students w/disabilities graduate at 67% success rate

- 90% of requested accommodations are universal/predictive
Why Students May Not Disclose

May not be aware they need to request supports or what supports are available
  ◦ Entitlement in K12
  ◦ Burden of Proof in HE

May want to separate themselves from a disability identity
May feel that they don’t need the supports anymore
May feel the environment isn’t supporting
What if?

10%, 15% or 20% of students disclose
- Could our existing infrastructure support the additional accommodations?
- What would be the cost to support the additional notetakers, proctors, interpreters, etc. needed?
Functional Disabilities Types

- **13.7%** Mobility
  - Serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs

- **10.8%** Cognition
  - Serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions

- **6.8%** Independent Living
  - Difficulty doing errands alone

- **5.9%** Hearing
  - Difficulty hearing

- **4.6%** Vision
  - Blindness or serious difficulty seeing

- **3.7%** Self-care
  - Difficulty dressing or bathing

Source: Centers for Disease Control & Prevention Info Graphic

Percentage of adults in Connecticut with select functional disability types

Source: Disability & Health U.S. State Profile Data for Connecticut (Adults 18+ years of age)
Cognitive and Physical Barriers to Education

Examples of barriers for people with cognitive, learning, and neurological disabilities

- Complex navigation mechanisms and page layouts that are difficult to understand and use.
- Complex sentences that are difficult to read and unusual words that are difficult to understand.
- Long passages of text without images, graphs, or other illustrations to highlight the context.
- Moving, blinking, or flickering content, and background audio that cannot be turned off.

Examples of barriers for people with physical disabilities

- Websites, web browsers, and authoring tools that do not provide full keyboard support.
- Insufficient time limits to respond or to complete tasks, such as to fill out online forms.
- Controls, including links with images of text, that do not have equivalent text alternatives.
- Missing visual and non-visual orientation cues, page structure, and other navigational aids.

Source: Diverse Abilities and Barriers (W3C)
Accessibility Helps All

90% of requested accommodations are universal/predictive

Accessibility efforts can lead to:

Better Student Engagement & Retention
- Accessible online coursework increases retention, persistence, and satisfaction among all students
- Source: The Bare-Bones Basics of UDL: Universal Design for Learning

Possible Institutional Reductions
- Need/costs for some accommodations
- Faculty time to address semester to semester requests

Federal Regulations Compliance
- Litigation Risk Reduction
Accessible Design Helps:

- Students with temporary disabilities
- Students for whom English is a second language (ESL)
- Multi-modal learners
- Students using mobile devices
- Students using older equipment, slow modems, or in places where sound is not allowed
- First generation and non-traditional students
- Students in disruptive environments (kids, roommates, public areas)
- Students who are stressed, distracted or under pressure
- Everyone
Accommodation ≠ Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Universal Design for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reworks products, materials, programs, instruction and environments to meet the unique needs of an individual.</td>
<td>Attempts to create a flexible design that is useable/accessible to a broad base of users/learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This method assumes a homogenous audience and awaits individual requests to adapt products, environments, materials, programs and instruction before considering these individuals.</td>
<td>Anticipates, in fact assumes, a diverse audience/heterogeneous group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires that an exception to the usual operation or method is made for an individual.</td>
<td>Inclusive from its original design/planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Northern Essex Community College: Accommodations vs. Universal Design for Learning
CSCU Accessibility Resources

Welcome

CSCU is committed to designing, promoting and maintaining a learning environment for all students that maximizes their inclusion and ability to achieve academic success.

Council

Resources

Training

CSCU Digital Accessibility Website (https://accessibility.ct.edu/)
# CSCU Accessibility Council Efforts

## Works Delivered
- CSCU Accessibility for EIT Policy Companion Guide
- CSCU Digital Accessibility Resource Website
- Course Content Accessibility Checklist
- CSCU Accessibility Overview presentation
- CSCU Accessibility Status Report template

## In Development
- Self-paced, online training course
- Faculty and staff recognition program
Remember

The disability community is the only minority group that anyone can join at any time.