RESOLUTION
Extending Existing Policy
concerning
Transfer of Students

December 13, 1972

WHEREAS, the Regional Community Colleges have established transfer curricula providing the first two years of baccalaureate study, and

WHEREAS, the State Colleges, as part of the public system of higher education in the State of Connecticut, accept the obligation to provide the opportunity for graduates of the public Community Colleges to continue their education to the baccalaureate level, be it

RESOLVED, that it is the policy of this Board that graduates of the transfer programs in the Regional Community Colleges who receive the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science Degree be admitted to the State Colleges provided they are recommended for such admission by the President of the Regional Community College granting the Associate Degree and provided they make application for admission by a common date specified by the colleges and that they make application in the manner prescribed by the colleges, and be it further

RESOLVED, that such students be admitted to the third year of study on the same basis as sophomore students are admitted to junior standing on the campus to which the Regional Community College graduate is admitted, and be it further

RESOLVED, that such students shall be required to complete not less than two years of study at a college granting baccalaureate degrees before the bachelor's degree may be awarded, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the guarantee of admission shall be to the State College system and not to a specific campus, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the implementation of this resolution be subject to on-going studies and further, that the Trustees will review this policy by the end of 1975.

***
MEMORANDUM

TO: James A. Frost
FROM: Searle F. Charles
DATE: December 6, 1972
RE: Transfer Agreement

I am sending to the Community College presidents a copy of the proposed resolution to the Board of Trustees of State Colleges as handed to me yesterday by Dr. Ritchie. I am also sending a memo to them indicating that you feel it is essential to keep the momentum going and what support you have behind you. Therefore, you are giving this to the Board of Trustees for action on Friday, and it would probably be to our advantage as a system, whatever our individual reactions might be, to make certain there is no negative public comment. It is understood that there will be further discussion between the Community College presidents and the State College presidents directly, regardless of whatever role you and I might play in preparing information.

I stress this last point, for candidly, there are reservations concerning with what conviction any agreement will be carried through on some of the campuses. I make that statement with the full realization that perhaps one or two of the State College presidents have concern about cooperation from some of the Community Colleges. The only way I see to get at this is through direct discussions.

We are both agreed, and I know the Community College presidents are still interested in the formation of a permanent liaison committee to work together, getting into some of these problems and making suggestions for improvements for the consideration of both sets of presidents in the months and years ahead.

I assume that the 60-hour limit is not to be taken literally. However, I also understand that there are expectations that this limit will be honored as an important guideline and cut-off for credit hours taken at a Community College.

Let me define what I mean by the different terms used above. If interpreted literally, the 60-hour limit might mean that a receiving State College under no circumstances would ever write anything into a student's record which would total more than 60 hours of transfer credit. In other words, a student at one of the Community Colleges where there might be 4-hour science courses, and who might have a couple of 2-hour courses in his curriculum, might wind up his program at a Community College with a total of 61 or 62 credit hours. Under this agreement, he would automatically be cut back to 60 hours if he transferred to a State College. If this is to be the case, I think it would
be unfortunate and most unfair to students, and the whole point of what we are doing here is to benefit students.

I am really myself anticipating that this limit is a guideline to be honored. By that I mean that the Community Colleges are not going to expect the State Colleges to accept students with 63 or 66 hours of transfer credit, several hours beyond the 60-hour limit. If this is the interpretation, then I think this is quite acceptable as a guideline, and the Community Colleges would be willing to honor it.

Let me cite a specific example where I would become concerned, and where I think the Community College presidents would become concerned. Suppose we have a veteran who took some college work before entering the service. He comes back and is uncertain about whether or not he wants to go to college. He attends a Community College part-time for perhaps three semesters, and then he finally decides he wants to wind up his work. He has one semester of time to devote to this and needs 9 credits, let's say, for an Associate Degree. However, in order to qualify for his full V.A. benefits, he must take 12 hours of work. So he takes the extra 3 credits. He is a good student, and he has a B average. Now, if he transfers to Eastern Connecticut State College, does this agreement mean he will be cut back to 60 hours automatically?

I assume we are saying there is a 60-hour limit with the understanding that if one of our Community Colleges offers a particular curriculum which happens to total 61 or 62 hours, no one is going to be concerned or penalize the students.

SFC/js
c: Community College Presidents
RECEIVED

DEC 6 1972

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FOR THE STATE COLLEGES
December 8, 1972

Board of Trustees for the State Colleges
1280 Asylum Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut

Attention: Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik, Chairman

Dear Mrs. Niejadlik:

At a meeting of the Faculty Senate held Wednesday, December 6, 1972, the Faculty Senate of Southern Connecticut State College passed the following resolution and directed me to forward this to you prior to the December 8th meeting of the Board.

"The Faculty Senate of Southern Connecticut State College de­
plores the adoption of the Resolution Concerning Transfer of Students by the Board of Trustees at this time. The Senate feels that adoption of this document by the Board of Trustees without prior consideration by the faculties of the State Col­leges is in direct violation of the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1966) page 12.

'The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruc­tion, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.'

'The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and Board to grant the degrees thus achieved.'

The Senate feels that the present situation concerning trans­fers to State Colleges from Community Colleges does not have sufficient urgency to warrant its approval by improper means. We urge the Board of Trustees to postpone all action on this proposal until the four State College faculties have had the opportunity to be involved in it."

Sincerely,

Edith DeBonis
President
Faculty Senate

cc: James Frost
Presidents of the Four State Colleges
Presidents of the Faculty Senates of Eastern, Western, Central Colleges
Dr. James A. Frost  
Executive Secretary  
Board of Trustees for State Colleges  
1280 Asylum Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut  

December 4, 1972  

Dear Dr. Frost:

The presidents of the Community Colleges, at their meeting on December 4, 1972, requested that we edit the more detailed agreement discussed at Southern Connecticut State College a few weeks ago with the two sets of presidents meeting again to agree on content.

They are not entirely satisfied with the proposed catalog agreement as long as some operating details are unresolved.

They believe it is essential to nail down operating agreements and then draft a catalog statement accordingly. I think this reflects the fact that the general agreement reached in 1967 has not worked as anticipated in practice, even though there have been instances of excellent cooperation.

I suggest you and I meet to discuss this. We request that your Board of Trustees not take action on December 8th.

Sincerely,

Searle F. Charles  
Executive Director  

SFC/js
December 20, 1972

The Honorable Rufus G. Rose

and

The Honorable Ruth C. Truex

Co-Chairman, and Members of the

Education Committee of the General Assembly

State Capital

Hartford, Connecticut

My dear Senator Rose and Mrs. Truex:

Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trustees for the State Colleges at its meeting held on December 13, 1972.

The one resolution guarantees that graduates of transfer programs in the Regional Community Colleges who are recommended by the President of the Community College will be accepted for admission to a State College. The other resolution results in a major reduction in the amount of money a student must deposit to hold a place in college and simplifies refined procedures for students who withdraw from college. These changes reflect the Board’s concern for students and are a part of its effort to provide them with better service.

If you desire further amplification of these matters please call upon me. The Executive Committee of the Board felt that the members of the Legislature’s Education Committee might be interested in these developments.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Frost

Executive Secretary

JAY/b
encl.

cc: The Honorable Howard M. Klebanoff
The Honorable Irving J. Stalberg
Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik
Board Members