

**SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY**

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

**DISCUSSION DRAFT**

*Pursuing Excellence, Inspiring Leadership, Embracing Communities*

---

**February 27, 2007**

**Southern Connecticut State University  
Draft Strategic Plan**

*Pursuing Excellence, Inspiring Leadership, Embracing Communities*

---

---

**TABLE of CONTENTS**

	PAGE
I. Statement from President Cheryl Norton to the Community	1
II. Executive Summary	2
III. How We Developed Our Plan: The Southern Strategic Planning Process	3
IV. Strategic Planning Assumptions and Demographics	6
V. Mission Statement	11
VI. Vision Statement	12
VII. Core Values	13
VIII. Overarching Goals and Strategic Initiatives	13
IX. The Next Steps: Implementation and Accountability	17
X. Southern: Grounded in Our Legacy and Anticipating Our Future	18
Appendix A: Contributors to the Strategic Plan’s Development	
Appendix B: Schedule of Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meetings, Working Groups and Town Meetings	
Appendix C: Summary of Comments from Faculty-Staff Focus Groups	
Appendix D: Summary of Comments from Student Focus Groups	
Appendix E: Connecticut’s Population Projection 1995 to 2025	
Appendix F: Insights Into Connecticut’s Future Economic Direction	
Appendix G: Current and Projected Employment By Major Occupational Groups	

**Southern Connecticut State University  
Draft Strategic Plan**

***Pursuing Excellence, Inspiring Leadership, Embracing Communities***

---

---

**I. Statement from President Cheryl Norton to the Community**

It is with great pride and enthusiasm that I present you with Southern Connecticut State University's Strategic Plan for the academic years 2007 through 2012. The Plan, *Pursuing Excellence, Inspiring Leadership, Embracing Communities*, reflects an abiding commitment to the academic core of the institution in service to our students and the employers and citizens of the State of Connecticut.

We at Southern realize that our institution resides in a community that is especially rich in its racial and immigrant populations. It is a community that has both urban and rural attributes. It is a community that has a diversity of socioeconomic backgrounds and experiences. It is a community we want to engage even more intentionally as we seek to become an even more significant player in Connecticut's knowledge economy. Please join me in our quest to become an exemplar in providing learning opportunities for the region, the state of Connecticut and beyond.

NOW is the time to act and make clear choices about the University's future. We welcome your partnership in making this plan our collective reality.

## **II. Executive Summary**

In February of 2006 Southern Connecticut State University launched a year-long university-wide strategic planning process with the intent of sharpening its mission and crafting a bold vision for the future. The process employed the time and energies of not only a 25-person Steering Committee, but also 10 working groups of 150 faculty, staff, and students. Literally hundreds of others provided valuable input by participating in focus groups, e-surveys, committee discussions, and town hall meetings. It would be difficult to identify a planning process anywhere that was more open, transparent, and participatory.

The University Strategic Plan draws substantially upon the 2004 Academic Strategic Plan to acknowledge the centrality of the academics to the mission of the University. Because they constitute the heart of the University, particular focus is placed on academic programs and faculty. Throughout the Plan there is clear coherence to the University's Core Values: **Excellence, Student Success, Access, Diversity, Life-long Learning, and Community Involvement.**

A new Mission Statement emerged that highlights the following:

- Its intentionally diverse character
- Its commitment to academic excellence and service to the public good
- Its distinction of having outstanding graduate programs
- How inspired students are by the scholarly activities of our teacher-scholars
- The value of liberal arts and sciences as the foundation for intellectual pursuits
- Its exemplary training in a number of professions
- Its empowerment of students for impassioned, ethical leadership in our rapidly changing, global society

With this clearly defined mission, the University aspires to:

- Become an exemplary student-centered university where all students are empowered to be successful by the support they receive to meet the academic challenges presented to them by outstanding teacher-scholars
- Strengthen all academic programs and continue to be one of the strongest graduate programs in New England
- Meet the growing state and national needs for graduates trained in STEM disciplines, nursing, education, social services, and business
- Expand the number of interdisciplinary programs in the liberal arts & sciences
- Become well-known for its contributions to the intellectual, artistic, cultural, and economic growth and vitality of the region
- Make significant contributions to closing educational achievement gaps, reducing health disparities, and achieving social justice
- Prepare its graduates for the increasingly important role of global citizenship

The Plan identifies 10 Overarching Goals that constitute institutional priorities for the next five years in order to realize its vision. Primary responsibility for achieving these goals and the strategic initiatives subsumed under them have been delegated to the vice presidents. President Norton is calling upon faculty, administrators, staff, students and community stakeholders to pull together with a renewed commitment to advance the University for the benefit of future generations and the communities we serve.

### **III. How We Developed Our Plan: An Overview of the Southern Planning Process**

#### *The Charge*

In the fall of 2005, President Norton announced the initiation of a University Strategic Planning Process. In February of 2006, she invited a number of campus leaders to serve directly in this process as members of the University Strategic Planning Steering Committee. This critical committee was charged with “aligning our new and renovated facilities with a strategic plan that will provide a renewed direction to innovative academic programming and support systems that will anticipate the future needs of our students and the community beyond our campus. The Steering Committee will guide the entire Southern community in sharpening its mission, shaping its vision, identifying and reaffirming its core values, and developing broad-based goals, leading to objectives and action steps that will move our institution to a new level of excellence and recognition.”

#### *University Strategic Planning Steering Committee Members*

Dr. Selase Williams, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, was delegated responsibility to Chair the University Strategic Planning Steering Committee. The members of the Steering Committee were broadly representative:

Sam Andoh, Faculty, School of Business, Economics and Finance  
Joe Brignola, Chief Information Officer Designee  
Christine Broadbridge, Faculty Academic Strategic Planning Committee  
Lise Brule, Ex. VP, Finance & Administration Designee  
Robert Delauro, Graduate Student Organization Designee  
Robert Demezzo, Administrative Faculty Senate Designee  
Maria Diamantis, Faculty Senate, School of Education, Elementary Education  
Marge Fadden, Administration  
DonnaJean Fredeen, Dean, Arts & Sciences  
Heather Fries, University Assistant  
Marcia Smith Glasper, Executive Assistant to the President, Diversity & Equity Programs  
Ron Herron, VP for Student & University Affairs  
Maria Houser, Interim Associate VP for Human Resources  
Marianne Kennedy, Coordinator for Assessment & Planning  
Patricia Lafayllve, Graduate Student Government Designee  
Geraldine Natkin, CSU Administrative Assistant

Claire Novosad, Faculty Academic Strategic Planning Committee  
Christine Petto, Faculty Academic Strategic Planning Committee, School of Arts  
and Sciences, History  
Richard Riccardi, Director, Office of Management, Information, & Research  
Megan Rock, VP for Institutional Advancement  
Michael Shea, Faculty, School of Arts and Sciences, English  
Robert Sheeley, Assoc. VP, Facilities Operations, & Capital Budget  
Cesarina Thompson, Faculty, School of Health and Human Services, Nursing  
Thuan Vu, Faculty, School of Arts and Sciences, Art  
Elyse Williams, Student Government Designee  
Selase Williams, Provost

The original structure of representation for the Strategic Planning Steering Committee can be found in Appendix A of this Strategic Plan.

To provide support for the work of the Steering Committee, the University also engaged the services of the Pappas Consulting Group Inc., an internationally recognized firm in strategic planning for higher education. The consulting team provided the Committee with expertise in effective methodologies for strategic planning in the higher education environment, assisted Committee members in their ongoing discussions and deliberations, and facilitated various focus groups and data gathering functions.

### *The Approach*

There were several working principles that provided the framework for the Steering Committee's work:

- The planning process needed to be a dialog reflecting broad input from all segments of the extended Southern community as to where Southern has been, where we are now, and where we want to go;
- The process should be informed by the numerous reports, studies, surveys, data, and plans that have been produced in recent years;
- Focus group discussions, on-line surveys, environmental scans, and an analysis of the institution's Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT analysis) should be utilized to gain the input needed;
- The work of the Steering Committee needed to be open and transparent to that community, using the latest technologies to widely communicate information about the process;
- Feedback should be obtained from the community along the way at key points in the process to help shape the final outcome;
- The resulting Strategic Plan should be as outcomes-oriented as possible.

### *The Planning Process*

From its inception in March 2006, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee met regularly (See Appendix B for a schedule of meetings) and its Chair reported progress and activities to the campus community and the President's Cabinet. In order to broaden further the participation of the University community, 10 Strategic Working Groups, each chaired by a representative member of the Steering Committee, were tasked to develop recommended goals, strategic initiatives and action steps concerning:

- Teaching and Learning
- Academic Program Development
- Student Life and Support Services
- Faculty Development, Scholarly/Creative Activity
- Community Engagement and Public Relations
- External Funds Development
- Information Competence, Technology, and Library Services
- Fiscal, Human, and Facilities Resources
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Marketing and Niche Development

While the Strategic Planning Steering Committee deliberated and as its members directed the work of the 10 Working Groups, the Strategic Planning consultants: conducted strategic planning training sessions; developed interview guides, administered focus group questionnaires and electronic surveys; worked with the Strategic Planning Steering Committee Chair to facilitate meetings of that committee and the development of the Strategic Planning website; conducted interviews and focus groups; analyzed and reported the common themes prevalent in the interviews, periodically consulted with the President; and provided other input as requested by the Steering Committee.

### *Community Input*

Through the various interviews and data collection activities, hundreds of Southern's students, faculty, staff and other stakeholders participated with candor and conviction as they shared their experiences, thoughts and perspectives. The input from the community was passionate, thoughtful, well-informed, and reflective of their deep feelings about Southern, their interest in its future, and their diverse ideas about where that future might reside. The predominant themes from this input are presented in Appendix C.

The Co-Chairs of the Faculty Academic Strategic Planning Committee were appointed to the Steering Committee to ensure that their vision influenced the development of this comprehensive Strategic Plan. In addition, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee met with the NEASC Self Study Team to collaborate and coordinate efforts. The Committee also met with various standing committees of the University.

Over the summer of 2006 the 10 Strategic Working Groups identified University needs within their specific area of focus, and developed a series of strategic initiatives and proposed action steps appropriate to address those needs.

Drawing upon the Working Groups' initial recommendations, the Steering Committee kept a rigorous pace and met, vetted ideas, and reached consensus during thousands of person hours (see Appendix B for a schedule of their meetings). The Steering Committee identified common overriding themes and priority needs across the different study areas, and began to merge those recommendations into one integrated plan. The result was a series of draft plans that included a new mission statement; a vision statement; core values statements; 9 overarching strategic goals; and over 50 strategic initiatives with proposed action steps and metrics for each initiative.

### *The Feedback*

As the draft versions of the Plan evolved, the Steering Committee presented these emerging results to the Southern community for feedback through a series of group discussions. Drafting the strategic plan became an iterative process, as the working approach and the plan content itself were continually adjusted to address the feedback received.

### *The Result*

This Strategic Plan highlights the Overarching Strategic Goals and Strategic Initiatives resulting from this deliberate process of widely inclusive campus input and extensive deliberations by the Steering Committee. The draft action steps and proposed metrics that support the Strategic Initiatives will be forwarded to the Cabinet to begin their implementation processes. This Strategic Plan and the draft action steps and metrics will enable each Vice President to begin to craft a division-wide implementation plan in his/her area in support of our new Strategic Plan: *Pursuing Excellence, Inspiring Leadership, Embracing Communities*.

PROCESS FLOW OF PROCESS TO BE COMPLETED BY STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE.

## **IV. Strategic Planning Assumptions and Demographics**

### *Institutional Assumptions*

During the course of our deliberations we made the following planning assumptions about our own institution:

1. Southern will continue to experience modest enrollment growth at both the undergraduate and graduate levels over the next 5 years.
2. Ninety percent of Southern's students will continue to come from the cities and towns in Connecticut and will return to those cities and towns to work after graduation.
3. Students and their parents will view themselves much more as discerning and demanding "customers".

4. Students who come to Southern will be more technologically literate than any previous group of students and they will expect their classroom experiences to draw heavily upon multimedia and computers.
5. Over the next five years, 25% of the full-time faculty will reach retirement age.
6. Over the next five years, **XX%** of the full-time staff will reach retirement age.
7. The University will need to engage in intentional succession planning, and reviewing its hiring profiles for incoming faculty to fulfill the needs for academic leadership, given the loss of institutional memory expected over the next 5 years as faculty and staff retire.
8. Faculty and staff who work at Southern will need to upgrade their technology skills continuously.
9. The University will need to reach out to an alumni body and keep track of their peripatetic lifestyle in order to foster long-term commitment to the University.
10. Southern will need to diversify its revenue stream and target corporate, foundation and other non-state appropriation revenues to make up the state funding gap.
11. Student need-based financial aid will continue to grow from both federal, state and institutional resources.

#### *Environmental Assumptions*

In addition to the internal institutional assumptions that guided our deliberations, we made ourselves aware of the myriad international, national and state factors that would, in all likelihood, impact Southern's overarching goals and strategic initiatives.

#### *International*

1. The world will continue to grow smaller; political, religious and catastrophic events in any part of the world will necessarily impact the fabric of American society.
2. The U.S. economy will continue to be interdependent upon world economies in all sections of the globe.
3. Although English will continue to be the primary language of the business world, Mandarin, Spanish and Arabic will play a strategic communications role.
4. The fluctuating financial value of the American dollar against foreign currencies will impact the fate of manufacturing, financial institutions and the service industries in the United States.

5. Barriers to foreign student enrollments in the U.S. that were enacted over the past 5 years will be reduced.
6. More countries will compete with the U.S. for international students by investing in new educational centers or partnering with overseas governments or universities.
7. Technology will link educational and research opportunities on a global scale for faculty and students.

#### National

1. Changes in political leadership will have significant impact on the social and educational agenda of the United States.
2. Health disparities, the educational achievement gap, high crime rates, high rates of drug and alcohol abuse, disproportionate incarceration rates for certain populations, and disregard for the environment from certain sectors will continue to plague the country.
3. The world of work and the world of play are becoming increasingly global, requiring professionals to be adaptable, multicultural, multilingual and engaged in the international market of ideas and technologies.
4. Business leaders will ratchet up their demand for a workforce that has fundamental oral and written communication skills, the capacity to reason logically and in an integrative manner, work in teams, and have basic analytical skills.
5. Colleges and universities will be expected to play a larger role in economic development nationally and internationally in order to remain competitive with emerging educational institutions in China, India, Australia and Europe.
6. There will continue to be a public outcry for accountability at all levels of the K-16 educational pipeline.
7. The role and relationships of four-year colleges and universities with the community colleges will become more and more tenuous and competitive as the community colleges offer more STEM-related (**S**cience, **T**echnology, **E**ngineering and **M**ath) bachelor's degrees and so-called applied bachelor's degrees.
8. Students and parents will continue to become more sophisticated "shoppers" for their educational needs, and will expect educational and administrative services to be delivered as professionally and efficiently as other services they receive in their personal and work life.

9. Technology will be increasingly used for teaching within the classroom as well as through non-classroom-based instruction.
10. Technology will continue its rapid evolution in the personal, professional, and educational life of students and their families.

#### Connecticut Environment

1. The New England region will experience a significant decline in the number of college-ready, college-age students by 2010. In Connecticut, the decline is projected to be **XXX**.
2. The distribution of the Connecticut population will shift considerably to an older age group.
3. The ethnic distribution of the Connecticut population will continue to reflect growth in the percentage of overall population from minority groups.
4. The economic revitalization of Connecticut will be dependent on growth in scientific and high-tech industries, small business development, advanced health care and social services. Professionals as well as support staff will be expected to communicate effectively, work collaboratively, be critical thinkers and creative problem solvers,
5. The tale and relationship of Southern with the Connecticut State University System and its member institutions will continue to be clarified and reshaped, given the future strategic direction of the Connecticut State University system.
6. State resources for higher education will continue to decline, rendering Southern more and more dependent on non-state revenues.
7. There will be more and more reporting and compliance requirements generated through the State government, Department of Education and the CSU System.
8. The CSU System will need to ensure that the missions of its member institutions are clearly delineated and communicated throughout the state in order to make a case for the four-year institutions and differentiate them from the University of Connecticut and its regional campuses.
9. Connecticut, like every other state in the Union will need to establish a balance of local legislative prerogative, gubernatorial agendas and Board vision with system/institutional mission, vision, and values.
10. Communities like New Haven will increasingly turn to institutions like Southern to address the social, economic, and educational needs of the community.

Connecticut Economy

1. In 1998, a task force of 125 business leaders from Connecticut identified six industry areas key to Connecticut's economic competitiveness: manufacturing, financial services, telecommunications and information, health care services, high technology and tourism.
2. The Connecticut Inner-City Business Strategy identified the following areas of opportunity for the city of New Haven: health services, metal manufacturing, entertainment, office services, education, and printing and publishing.
3. According to a 2004 economic report, Connecticut has a relative lack of early stage capital and incubation space and comparatively weak infrastructure, entrepreneurial activity, and corporate involvement with universities.
4. Total employment in Connecticut is expected to increase by more than 150,000 or 8.5% over the 10-year period 2004 and 2014. In addition, another 420,000 workers will be needed to replace those that leave the workforce due to retirement or other reasons.
5. Connecticut's industrial make-up, along with the rest of the nation, will continue its shift from a manufacturing-based to a service-based economy. By 2014, Connecticut's manufacturing industry will employ just under 10% of the workforce, higher than the 8.2% at the national level.
6. Sixty percent of the twenty fastest growing occupations in Connecticut will require a minimum of a bachelor's or master's degree and command salaries in excess of \$75,000 annually.
7. As measured by the number of new jobs created, nearly half of Connecticut's leading careers will be management, professional and technical occupations.
8. In the report *New England 2020*, it is estimated that the number of minority group young workers (25-29) in southern New England will grow to 50%. All New England states except New Hampshire will experience a decreasing percentage of the young population holding bachelor's degrees or higher. This looms as a potential threat to the Connecticut economy.
9. The total working-age population in Connecticut is declining, so the percentage of minority workers will grow from 17% in 1990 to 28%.
10. Connecticut suffers persistent out-migration of mid-life and older working-age populations. Therefore, Connecticut depends on in-migration of young people and students to make up its population growth. 43% of in-migration young people come for educational purposes.

*The Consequences of the Planning Assumptions*

1. It will be important for Southern to have systems and functions in place to continually monitor external trends and requirements.
2. Southern will need to adapt planning, focus and academic programming to respond to external changes as they occur, if not before.
3. More colleges and universities in Connecticut will be competing harder for the same in-state students.
4. Colleges and universities will become more entrepreneurial in developing and adapting their programs and the delivery of instruction.
5. The principal growth in higher education enrollments will be in the graduate, professional, part-time, and continuing learning populations.
6. Southern's use of technology for recruitment and teaching, and the need to incorporate training in the technology that students will use in their fields into the curriculum and pedagogy, will continue to grow in importance in Southern's emphasis and resource allocations.

**V. Mission Statement**

Southern Connecticut State University is an intentionally diverse, comprehensive university committed to access and academic excellence, to social justice and service for the public good. As a student-centered institution, Southern seeks to instill in all students the value of the liberal arts and sciences to life-long learning; and, as the leading graduate education center within the Connecticut State University System, Southern enriches the undergraduate experience with our distinguished graduate programs. At both the graduate and undergraduate levels, Southern provides educational innovation and exemplary professional training in a variety of disciplines. Inspired by a commitment to research, scholarship, and creative activities, our teacher-scholars energize the classroom as they seek answers to society's most pressing questions and strive to empower every undergraduate and graduate student with the knowledge, skills, and perspectives essential for active participation and impassioned, ethical leadership in our rapidly changing, global society.

## **VI. Vision Statement**

### A Model University

Southern Connecticut State University will become nationally recognized as a model teaching and learning institution where faculty engage in outstanding research and creative activity and where students are academically challenged by regionally, nationally, and internationally recognized faculty. Southern is an exemplary student-centered institution that works with all facets of the student's university experience. As such, Southern will empower its students with the academic skills, the intellectual tools, and the practical experiences to be successful in their chosen fields of study and in their life's work. Southern's students will be highly sought after by domestic and international employers because of their excellent critical thinking skills, problem-solving abilities, cultural literacy, understanding of technology, quantitative reasoning, ethical values, effective oral and written communication abilities, and overall leadership skills.

### Our Strengths

Southern will continue to have one of the strongest and largest undergraduate and graduate education centers in New England, and will elevate its graduate programs to even higher levels of excellence. The institution will capitalize on those programs by continuing to foster an important synergy between graduate and undergraduate programs and their faculty, on a strong liberal arts foundation, to provide a unique benefit to our students. Thoughtfully utilizing existing, new, and technological resources, the University will develop, expand and/or enhance our undergraduate and graduate programs so as to help to meet the growing state and national needs for individuals trained in STEM disciplines (**S**cience, **T**echnology, **E**ngineering and **M**ath), education, nursing, social services, and business. At the same time, we will expand our liberal arts foundation and cultivate interdisciplinary programs that lead to richer and fuller understandings of the human experience, in all of its complexities and in relation to its environment.

### Engagement with our Community

Through a variety of curricular and extracurricular programs, the institution will become well known for its contributions to the intellectual, artistic, cultural, and economic growth and vitality of the region. In collaboration with other organizations, Southern will make significant contributions to closing educational achievement gaps, reducing health disparities, and achieving social justice. The University will prepare students for social responsibility and global citizenship through the provision of exciting opportunities for community engagement and expanded international education programs. Southern will also demonstrate itself to be an invaluable resource to the Greater New Haven community and the region, through educational partnerships, professional development opportunities, and community service. Southern will also become increasingly known

for graduates who exhibit exceptional leadership abilities and a commitment to improving the human condition.

In all it does, Southern will strive to be innovative, always looking for new and creative approaches to accomplishing its mission, while being socially, fiscally, and environmentally responsible.

## **VII. Core Values**

- **Excellence:** The University values exemplary and distinguished performance in all aspects of University life by all members of the University community, especially in the areas of teaching, learning, scholarship, and service.
- **Student Success:** The University values all students, believes in their potential to achieve, and commits to challenging, supporting, and empowering them to transform their lives.
- **Access:** The University values its responsibility to provide opportunities for individuals with potential and motivation to become productive members of the University Community and demonstrates that value by eliminating barriers that hinder full participation.
- **Diversity:** The University values an educational and work environment in which individuals and cultures are celebrated and respected for the unique talents, insights, and perspectives that they contribute.
- **Life-Long Learning:** The University values the pursuit of knowledge and provides an environment for all individuals to learn and develop throughout the various phases of their lives.
- **Community Involvement:** The University values community service, civic engagement, and social responsibility by all University members and encourages the integration of these principles in the learning experiences of students, invites community participation in University affairs, and promotes local, regional, national, and international collaborations.

## **VIII. Overarching Goals and Strategic Initiatives**

There are nine overarching goals which comprise our plan. They are:

### **A. Strengthen undergraduate and graduate academic programs and effectively integrate academics, administrative and student services, community engagement, and campus life.**

- Formulate an Academic Program Plan that establishes clear priorities for new and existing resources.

1. Develop a cohesive undergraduate General Educational program.
  2. Develop and integrate a rich array of interdisciplinary programs and courses.
  3. Design or revise curricular and extracurricular programs that enrich inquiry into global issues and broaden cross-cultural perspectives.
  4. Increase the resources and improve the infrastructure to strengthen undergraduate major programs and to advance academic excellence in graduate education.
  5. Ensure that academic needs drive the allocation of library resources.
- Incorporate community engagement activities into the life of the University.
  - Improve student academic support services to meet changing student needs.
  - Create an integrated Enrollment Service Center to serve our students efficiently and effectively.

**B. Enhance structures and resources to support faculty development.**

- Foster an institutional climate of excellence in teaching, scholarship and creativity.
- Increase resources available for faculty research and creative activity.
- Establish a Center for Teaching and Learning.
- Increase the resources allocated for the recruitment, orientation, and professional development of new faculty.

**C. Become a regional leader in the use of technology to support student learning.**

- Enhance the effective use of technology in the classroom.
- Enhance the University's opportunities for non-place-bound education.
  1. Strengthen the University's existing online programs.
  2. Increase the number and/or percentage of hybrid courses.
  3. Develop distance education programs for the community.
- Create a program of specialized professional development for faculty in the various modes of delivering technology-assisted instruction.

- Expand the number of current or proven technologies available to faculty, staff and students to enhance teaching, learning and research.

**D. Develop an effective plan for student success.**

- Attract and retain a larger percentage of highly qualified students.
- Create an organized and integrated process for enrollment management.
- Improve undergraduate advisement in the University Advising Center and among faculty at the departmental level.
- Develop a systematic approach to improve retention, academic achievement, and graduation rates for undergraduate students.
- Manage enrollments to align with a quality educational experience for all students and appropriate workload levels for faculty and staff.

**E. Foster a campus climate and explore programs that respectfully include and celebrate diversity.**

- Attract, retain and support a diverse faculty, staff and student population.
- Increase resources for new and existing programs and activities to promote diversity in its various forms.

**F. Increase funding from external resources to support the University's mission.**

- Determine the institutional priorities from the Strategic Plan for external funding support.
- Explore innovative approaches to securing external funds to support the capital development of the University.
- Create a comprehensive and integrated marketing plan that communicates a clear image of the University's mission and vision to both internal and external constituencies.
- Define clearly the mission, roles, and goals of University offices responsible for soliciting external funding to ensure working in a coordinated manner.
- Build stronger relationships with current University supporters and create opportunities for new relationships.
- Work in partnership with the University Foundation and the Alumni Association in appropriate fundraising and other activities in support of the University.
- Expand and coordinate a University-wide community outreach plan.

**G. Develop an effective information management system to inform decision-making in all areas of the University.**

- Identify and organize IT functions that are required to meet University-wide needs into an architectural framework that facilitates planning and implementation activities of integrated solutions.
- Define appropriate roles and responsibilities for each level of the University IT framework.
- Allocate appropriate resources for each layer of the University IT framework.
- Implement processes that support aligning IT solutions to user needs.
- Implement programs to support ongoing alignment of IT solutions with University needs.
- Develop and implement a Strategic Information Technology Plan that takes full advantage of existing IT resources, better organizes the deployment of those resources, and builds a sustainable infrastructure to move Southern fully into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**H. Strengthen our organizational structures and operations to improve institutional effectiveness and communication.**

*Regarding Service Levels and Optimizing Limited Resources:*

- Clarify and redefine reporting structures, responsibilities of units, and accountability.
- Improve administrative support services and reduce the complexity of administrative processes.
  1. Create and disseminate widely a Southern Administrative Manual so that policies and procedures are explicit and available to all employees.
  2. Improve policy and procedure development and implementation, including establishing mechanisms to formalize and regularize the creation and review of all policies.
- Enhance the professional development of all staff.
- Review and align staffing levels across the campus in order to improve the quality of service to students, faculty, and the community.
- Improve mechanisms for efficient communication within the University community and its constituent parts regarding all activities and developments at the University.

*Regarding On-going Strategic Planning and Assessment:*

- Institutionalize collaborative strategic planning for the institution in support of its mission.
- Create and maintain an ongoing assessment of the Strategic Plan.
- Develop thoughtful and reliable processes for periodically assessing the performance of programs, faculty, students, staff, and administrators.

**I. Ensure a campus that is environmentally responsible, safe, attractive, and conducive to learning and high levels of productivity.**

- Develop a clear and comprehensive Facilities Use Plan to optimize space utilization.
- Revise the Facilities Master Plan to reflect existing and projected campus needs.
- Conduct a systematic review of staffing levels and distribution so as to appropriately maintain existing and planned facilities.
- Develop an Emergency Management Plan to ensure the continuing viability of the University in the event of emergencies affecting the institution.

**IX. The Next Steps: Implementation and Accountability**

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee has been an exemplar organization. Each of its members has given selflessly of her/his time for the benefit of the University as a whole. What is remarkable is their willingness to leave their own professional biases and agenda behind and work on behalf of the University community in its broadest definition, and we formally thank them for their outstanding contributions.

It is now time to think intentionally about the manner in which this Strategic Plan will guide our programmatic efforts and drive our institutional priority setting and budget processes over the next 5 years. It will be critical that we be tested and hold ourselves accountable to achieve the results that are called for in this Strategic Plan. It is therefore important that we continue to conduct this planning process in an open atmosphere, and report back to the community on a regular basis. We will continue to work with the Pappas Consulting Group and their consultants who have served as our facilitators to help us now design those processes necessary to move our Strategic Plan into detailed action.

To implement the Strategic Plan, each Vice President will be assigned those portions of the Strategic Initiatives and Action Steps appropriate to his/her Division. We will also appoint an oversight group of broad campus representation to monitor the progress of the implementation and report that progress on a periodic basis to the community. Any hurdles being encountered, or changes in the plan due to changing circumstances, will

also be monitored and reported. As we did with the planning process itself, we will communicate regularly with the community through the standing councils, periodic town meetings, through postings to our web site, and by special announcements as warranted.

In order to create needed momentum for our plan, we are already setting parameters for one or two major Strategic Initiatives that might impact the AY 2007-2008 budget. Given the timing of this plan, it will not be possible to drive all resource allocation decisions for AY 2007-2008 through this plan. We do expect, however, that the AY 2008-2009 budget will be driven primarily by this plan and the strategic plans of the various divisions that comprise this University.

## **X. Southern: Grounded in Our Legacy and Anticipating Our Future**

Like many state colleges and universities in this country, Southern Connecticut State University started as a two-year teacher training school in 1893 known as New Haven State Normal School. In 1937, the institution became known as New Haven State Teacher's College and began to grant the bachelor's degree. In 1954, the Connecticut State Board of Education authorized the institution to grant the Master of Science degree. In 2002, Southern received its first authorization to grant a doctoral degree.

Over the past 50 years, Southern underwent further transformation academically and its name changed two additional times. In 1959, Southern expanded its curricular offerings to include the liberal arts and sciences. Over the next several decades the physical plant modernized and both the undergraduate and graduate programs diversified further. In 1983, Southern Connecticut State College changed to be Southern Connecticut State University and concurrently became a part of the Connecticut State University System.

In recent years, Southern has been transformed physically with the infusion of \$260 million of capital expenditures to upgrade the academic learning environment. Space in the Buley Library is being doubled, technology research tools are being upgraded, Engleman Hall has been vastly expanded, and in 2006 the new Michael J. Adanti Student Center was opened.

Today's Southern is a vibrant, culturally rich and ethnically diverse environment. In addition to its extensive academic offerings, Southern hosts lectures, workshops in literature and dance, art exhibits, performances by professional and student artists, conferences, and institutes on a variety of topics that enrich, instruct, and delight. Through offering courses on part-time, day and evening bases, Southern has been innovative in providing access to a high quality education to a wide range of students. The campus clinics provide diagnosis and treatment of learning disabilities and speech, hearing, and reading problems. As a busy university with a strong identity and a rich history, Southern looks ahead to a future as varied, dynamic, responsive, and responsible as its past. The next decade will see Southern continue to evolve, meeting the challenges and seizing the opportunities a new century brings.

Southern's future will be yet another iteration of the capacity it has shown in the past to adapt to, and often lead, evolving educational needs and changing conditions. It is important to be fully aware of and appreciate our past history, which grounds us in our experience while driving us toward our future and helping to identify gateways that will take us to that future.

Our community of students, faculty, staff and administrators looks forward to working with the residents and employers of New Haven and the citizens of Connecticut to realize the Mission and fulfill the Vision of Southern Connecticut State University.

**Appendix A**

**Contributors to the Strategic Plan's Development**

---

**President's Cabinet:**

President Cheryl Norton, Ed.D.  
Dr. Selase Williams, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Mr. James Blake, Executive VP and VP for Finance and Administration  
Ms. Megan Rock, VP for Institutional Advancement  
Dr. Ronald Herron, VP for Student and University Affairs  
Dr. Alvin Chai, Chief Information Technology Officer  
Dr. Marcia Smith Gasper, Executive Assistant to the President, Director of Diversity and Equity  
Ms. Maria Houser, Interim Associate Vice President for Human Resources

**Original Representation for University Strategic Planning Steering Committee:**

1. Provost/VP for Academic Affairs (chair)
2. Staff- At Large (selected by Administrative Faculty Senate)
3. Staff- At Large (appointed by President)
4. President of Student Government
5. VP for Student and University Affairs (or designee)
6. Chief Information Officer (or designee)
7. VP for Institutional Advancement (or designee)
8. Exec. VP for Administration and Finance (or designee)
9. Co-Chair of Faculty Academic Strategic Plan. Com.
10. Co-Chair of Faculty Academic Strategic Plan. Com.
11. Faculty-At-Large (selected by Faculty Academic Senate)
12. Faculty-At-Large (selected by Faculty Academic Senate)
13. Faculty-At-Large (appointed by President)
14. Faculty-At-Large (appointed by President)
15. Director of Academic Assessment and Planning
16. Associate VP for Facilities, Operations, and Capital Budget
17. One Academic Dean
18. Associate VP for Human Resources (or designee)
19. One member of Graduate Student Organization
20. Director of Equity and Diversity

3/13/06

Strategic Working Groups

Co-Chairs	Mr. Thuan Vu Dr. Maria Diamantis Mr. Joe Brignola	Dr. DonnaJean Fredeen	Dr. Christine Broadbridge Dr. Claire Novosad Ms. Lise Brule	Dr. Marcia Smith Glasper Dr. Marianne Kennedy	Dr. Sam Andoh Ms. Megan Rock
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
	<b>Teaching and Learning</b>	<b>Academic Program Development</b>	<b>Student Life and Support Services</b>	<b>Faculty Dev, Scholarly/Creative Activity</b>	<b>Community Engagement &amp; Public Relations</b>
	Dr. Barbara Aronson Dr. Mark Cameron  Mrs. Deborah Fairchild Dr. Alan Friedlander Dr. Terese Gemme Dr. Greg Cochenet Dr. Jane McGinn Dr. Michael Perlin  Dr. Lisa Rebesch Dr. Tony Rosso Dr. David Squires Mr. LeRoy Ward Ms. Suzanne Tucker Ms. Vanessa Raney Dr. Mike Shea Dr. Carlos Arboleda	Dr. William Faraclas Mrs. Alyson Fedak Dr. Camille Serchuk Dr. Shirley Girouard Dr. Steve Larocco Dr. Joseph Manzella Dr. David Pettigrew Ms. Marie Geelan Dr. Matthew Enjalran Dr. Meg Sargeant	Ms. Janet Anderson Dr. George Appleby Mr. Brian Delauro Ms. Andrea Barton Mrs. Jane Ciarlone Ms. Monica Raffone Ms. Sharleen Dickinson Mr. Tom Ferruci Ms. Patricia Whelan Ms. Christine Barrett Dr. John Scheuermann Ms. Brigitte Stiles Ms. Kelly Mann Mr. Thomas Madera Mr. Lewis Deluca Dr. Rosemaire Conforti Dr. Christine Petto	Dr. Sandra Bulmer Dr. Paul Cascella Dr. Marie Selvaggio Dr. Nicholas Edington Dr. Robert Eldridge Dr. Debra Emmelman Dr. Bonnie Farley-Lucas Dr. Adam Goldberg Dr. Esther Howe  Dr. Kimberly Lacey Dr. Kelly Ritter Dr. Linda Sampson Mr. Ali Zamouri	Ms. Delinda Conte Ms. Geraldine Prince Ms. Dawn Holmes Dr. Todd Rofuth Mr. Larry Tomasck Mr. Jack Mordente Mr. James Barber Mr. Jeff Slomba Mr. Patrick Dilger Mr. Joe Musante

<b>Co-Chairs</b>	<b>Mr. Robert Sheeley Dr. Jim Mazur</b>	<b>Mr. Cecil Murphy Mr. Rick Riccardi</b>	<b>Dr. Ces Thompson</b>	<b>Dr. Ron Herron</b>	<b>Mrs. Marge Fadden Mr. Rob Demezzo</b>
	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>J</b>
	<b>External Funds Development</b>	<b>Information Competence, Technology, &amp; Lib Services</b>	<b>Fiscal, Human, and Facilities Resources</b>	<b>Institutional Effectiveness</b>	<b>Marketing and Niche Development</b>
	Ms. Patricia Zibluk Dr. Suzanne Carrol Mr. Vincent Ferrie Dr. Roz Amenta Dr. Jim Granfield Ms. Kathy Yalof Dr. Vince Breslin Dr. Yan Liu Ms. Judite Fernandes	Mr. Tim Klassen Mr. Tom McCormack Dr. Nichole Fluhr Ms. Nancy Bobrek Ms. Colleen Yacono Dr. Daniel Sonenson Dr. Imad Antonios Mr. John Young Mr. Mark Waters Ms. Cindi Scholfield-Bodt	Mr. Toby Bates Mr. David Denino Dr. Cesarina Thompson Mrs. Rosa Clough Dr. James Dolan Ms. Valerie Pettie-Cooper Ms. Amanda Pysh Ms. Carol Wallace Mr. David Starkey Mr. Aaron Washington Mr. Cort Sierpinski Mr. Craig Patenaude	Mrs. Rose Cretella Dr. Michael Ben-Avie Ms. Andrea-Lynne Decrosta Mrs. Carol Dojny Ms. Michelle Mann Ms. Jane Marrone Ms. Lynn Kohn Ms. Hing Wu Dr. Sandra Holley Dr. Lori Verplaetse Ms. Joanne Mielczarski Dr. Jeannette Oppedisano Dr. Rex Gilliland Ana Rivera Alfano Dr. Robert Vaden-Goad Ms. Diane Boutaugh	Ms. Paula Kennedy Ms. Paula Rice Ms. Cathy Christy Ms. Robin Sauerteig Ms. Elyse Williams Dr. Peter Madonia Dr. Shyam Lodha Ms. Meg Elliot Mr. PJ Rossitto Dr. Ellen Beatty

**APPENDIX B**

---

---

**Schedule of Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meetings, Working Groups and  
Town Meetings**

**University Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting dates**

March 3, 2006  
 March 10, 2006 (Working Group Retreat)  
 March 31, 2006 (with NEASC)  
 April 21, 2006  
 May 12, 2006  
 May 19, 2006  
 June 9, 2006  
 June 23, 2006  
 July 14, 2006  
 July 28, 2006  
 August 11, 2006  
 August 25, 2006  
 September 15, 2006  
 September 22, 2006  
 September 29, 2006 (Town Hall meeting)  
 October 13, 2006  
 October 27, 2006  
 November 3, 2006  
 November 10, 2006  
 November 17, 2006 (2<sup>nd</sup> Town Hall meeting)  
 December 1, 2006  
 December 15, 2006  
 January 19, 2007 (Strategic Retreat)

**Working Group Meeting Dates**

Marketing and Niche Development	Faculty Development, Scholarly/Creative Activity
3/16/06	3/10/06
3/30/06	3/17/06
4/6/06	3/27/06
4/13/06	4/7/06
4/20/06	4/24/06
4/27/06	
5/4/06	
5/11/06	
5/18/06	
5/25/06	
6/8/06-Work group preparation meeting	
9/21/06	

<b>Academic Program Development</b>	<b>Teaching &amp; Learning</b>
3/15/06	3/17/06
3/31/06	4/17/06
4/12/06	4/28/06
4/24/06	5/5/06
5/11/06	6/2/06
6/7/06	6/16/06
6/15/06	6/30/06
	7/14/06
	7/28/06
<b>Student Life &amp; Support Services</b>	<b>Fiscal, Human, &amp; Facilities Resources</b>
3/10/06	3/10/06
3/31/06	3/24/06
4/21/06	4/3/06
5/5/06	5/1/06
5/19/06	
<b>Community Engagement &amp; Public Relations</b>	<b>External Funds Development</b>
3/10/06	3/10/06
4/7/06	4/21/06
4/21/06	6/20/06
5/5/06	
5/19/06	
<b>Information Compliance, Technology &amp; Library Services</b>	<b>Institutional Effectiveness</b>
3/10/06	3/10/06
3/29/06	4/7/06
5/10/06	4/27/06
8/2/06	5/18/06
	5/24/06

*Numerous "electronic meetings" occurred besides the regular scheduled meetings where the working groups met as a total group. The electronic meetings had great electronic conversation and much editing, commenting, and revising of drafts.*

**Community Feedback Sessions**

<b>OPEN TOWN MEETING CAMPUS SESSIONS</b>	<b>MEETINGS WITH STANDING UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES</b>
September 29, 2006	Faculty Senate
November 17, 2006	Faculty Academic Strategic Planning Committee (FASP)
	Administrative Faculty Senate
	Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)
	Graduate Council

**APPENDIX C**

---

**Summary of Comments from Faculty-Staff Focus Groups**

## **SUMMARY OF FACULTY AND FACULTY-STAFF FOCUS GROUPS**

In May, the Pappas Consulting Group Inc. conducted seven focus groups with faculty. Approximately 35 were in attendance during these sessions. On June 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, we conducted an additional 5 focus groups. As many faculty were unable to attend the May focus groups, faculty were invited to participate in the already scheduled Staff focus groups. Approximately 80 staff members and 35 faculty were in attendance during those sessions. All of the sessions were characterized by candor and lively participation.

The following is a summary of the principal themes that emerged from these discussions.

### **STRENGTHS**

- Education has a strong reputation; it was the first doctoral level program.
- Nursing program is well regarded.
- Communicative disorders program has strength.
- There is a diverse student body: ethnic, age, first generation students.
- Southern has very competitive salaries.
- Teaching is valued, and there is generally a high level of teaching.
- Strong support system in place for faculty teaching.
- Southern provides access to all students who can benefit.
- Southern is a teaching school that honors scholarship (although that honoring is not always clearly manifested).
- Some improvement in student quality has been achieved.
- There is freedom and some nominal support to seek grants.
- Academic technology support is decent.
- A graduate program review process (Academic standards, Graduate Council) that over the last 6-8 years has been strengthened.
- There are certain levels of development support: \$1,000 travel; new computer every 3 years; research grants.
- We have access to Yale libraries (although largely on a paid basis).
- Facilities are improving.
- There are some “great treasures” among the faculty.
- The public perception of us is improving.
- The strategic planning process is open.
- We have a strong staff.

## WEAKNESSES

- Lack of clarity about mission, vision, values – these are not shared.
- The current academic strategic plan does not address program distinctiveness.
- There is not a culture of making tough decisions at the institution.
- There is no mandated external review of academic programs.
- Faculty hires are often regional (Note: budget for each search limited to a total of \$2,000).
- There is no evaluation criteria to reward academic advising.
- There are two distinct faculty camps: one who strongly supports open admissions; the other who wants to raise standards.
- The availability of courses is uneven, especially for undeclared majors.
- Little support exists for technology infusion (concern about CSU decision to invest in Vista) or on-line teaching.
- Union contract terms and administration requirements mean a lot of excess bureaucracy.
- We are currently very disciplined/departmentally oriented. There is competitiveness among departments, with only modest collaborations across departments.
- The academic budget process not well understood.
- Lack of good, shared data on student performance (e.g., performance of community college students vs. native students) and faculty activity (e.g., percentage of student credit hours taught by permanent faculty).
- There are various inconsistencies across colleges (e.g., summer course minimums).
- There is a lack infrastructure in place to support grants. Grant seeking still does not appear to be a priority.
- Mid-level administrators do not recognize the academic purpose of the institution and are overly influenced by state agency culture.
- Some support offices (e.g., counseling; students with disabilities) are only open daytime hours, not open for evening students.
- Student services do not appear to be student centered nor integrated. (“Geographically but not attitudinally one-stop.”)
- There is not good oversight of adjunct faculty.
- Very poor follow through on committee recommendations regarding programs.
- Faculty orientation processes are virtually non-existent.
- We are an information poor culture (e.g., not clear who is responsible for what; website not very robust.); little information management control.
- There is not a vigorous interaction with regional economic development.
- Advocacy for increasing faculty diversity is inadequate.
- The Human Resources department is not professional and does not respect confidentiality.
- Weak and unevenly applied performance measurement system.
- Administrative Technology support is weak and the ability to generate reports is limited due to lack of priority and absence of staff.
- Enrollment management systems and processes is non-existent.

- There is a siloed and competitive administrative structure.
- We have lingering vestiges of “dysfunctional family”/male dominated culture.
- There is a perception of vindictiveness and lack of respect from certain middle level staff, and supervisors to subordinates, with no consequence management regarding these actions.

### OPPORTUNITIES

- Making decisions to stop doing certain things so as to provide focus.
- Improving retention and graduation rates by holding departments accountable.
- Strengthening university-wide services, especially student recruitment and retention.
- Providing leadership in promoting the CSU System and for having the whole greater than the sum of the parts (rather than simply bureaucratic).
- Developing a program to assist bright students to meet academic standards.
- Moving away from a discipline-based view to thematic/interdisciplinary view through a new general education program.
- Creating more interdisciplinary opportunities by major at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Engaging in greater collaboration with the community colleges (programmatically) and high schools.
- Assessing optimal use of faculty time (opportunity to reduce clerical, non-value added functions e.g., departmental reports).
- Making an aggressive case to legislature about Southern; this has not yet been done.
- Redesigning summer program with a different business model (incentives for early choice; lower tuition).
- Using technology to allow a “catch-up.”
- Making more use of our location to enhance educational opportunities (e.g., New York City, Boston, etc.)
- Instituting creative approaches to study abroad.
- Responding to some additional regional need for focused graduate programs.
- Being more engaged in the community and region.

### THREATS

- Limited state budgets; limited ability to raise tuition; limited potential to raise private funds.
- Divisiveness of those programs with GPA requirements and those with no requirements (particularly liberal arts).
- Non-competitive, especially fiscally, in summer courses per credit rate for part-time students (vs. community colleges and UConn).
- Add-on mentality versus choice culture.
- Lack of communication regarding decision-making.
- Increasing reliance on adjunct faculty.
- Workload seems to be leading to faculty retention and recruitment issues (and ability to hire first choices, as evidenced by a number of failed searches).

- Loss of faculty talent to administrative assignments (e.g., faculty development; assistant to Deans).
- Not well linked to the community, and are not playing a significant role.
- Public Health program competition from UConn and Yale where both have schools versus a program at Southern.
- Inability to clarify and then market identity in an increasingly competitive higher education marketplace.

**APPENDIX D**

---

**Summary of Comments from Student Focus Groups**

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS**

In May, the Pappas Consulting Group conducted eight focus groups with students at Southern Connecticut State University. The students were self-selected volunteers, who attended these available sessions based upon announcements posted on campus regarding the open sessions and the schedule of meetings. A total of 44 students attended the sessions. These students represented a good cross-section of levels (graduate and undergraduate; freshman through senior), resident and non-resident, traditional and non-traditional, full-time and part-time, Connecticut and out-of-state students.

The following is a summary of the principal themes that emerged from these discussions.

### **REASONS FOR ATTENDING**

- Nearby location (most students participating were from southern Connecticut).
- Affordable cost (though concern was expressed about the continuing rise in tuition rates over the past several years).
- Availability of the academic program desired.
- Variety of academic programs available (including Honors program).
- Recommendations from others.
- Atmosphere of campus.
- Good athletic programs and facilities.
- Rolling admissions allowed for making a late decision.

### **MAJOR SURPRISES FOR STUDENTS UPON ARRIVAL**

- The requirement of a *pre-major* program before one could be confirmed into the desired major (this was not clear during the admissions process).
- The low quality of food services.
- The proportion of commuter students.
- The lack of weekend activities.
- Excess of party life on campus.
- Academic quality was better than expected.
- The facilities are being constantly improved.
- Class sizes are a bit larger than expected, but are still very good compared with other schools.
- Some undergraduate courses are pretty light-weight; some graduate courses can be overwhelmingly challenging.
- Lack of standardization in courses.
- How much I have enjoyed Southern *beyond* what I expected; lots of opportunities for most students.
- Friendly close-knit campus, easy to make friends.
- The immediate area around Southern is not good, very crime-ridden; not what I was used to in a small rural community.

## SIGNIFICANT STRENGTHS

### *Faculty/Academics:*

- There is an obvious high commitment to *students* and *teaching* at Southern.
- Faculty overall were rated very highly by students in terms of their knowledge of their subject matter and their teaching effectiveness.
- Most faculty were seen as very committed to teaching and interested in student well-being.
- The programs at Southern are seen overall as of good quality.
- With some individual exceptions, course content was viewed as very good.
- For *graduate* students, the quality of the Advising function was consistently rated high among the focus groups.
- Most faculty seem to enjoy what they are doing, and being at Southern.
- Most classes are small, allowing students to be known to their instructors by name.
- Research is a growing activity on campus, but teaching is still the #1 priority.
- The grad school is growing, and is a solid program (“the graduate flagship of the four CSUs”); more support (including financial, housing) needs to be given to these full-time students.

### *Technology:*

- A number of classrooms are now outfitted with good teaching technology equipment.
- The technology installed was seen as good.
- The computer labs available to students seem to be sufficient in number.
- The library has lots of computers and labs and is well plugged into online resources.

### *Other strengths noted were:*

- There are some top-notch students at Southern, many of whom do not know the talents they have.
- There is new administrative leadership in place at Southern that seems to care about student input.
- The campus is growing and changing physically (many positive comments were made about the new student center).
- Living conditions on campus are good (size, security, physical condition); the campus is *clean*, with people working on it all day long; good facilities services.
- The library, with great access to resources.
- The size, in terms of physical space and number of students, is “just right.”
- The school is very accessible for commuter students in southern Connecticut.
- Southern is close to downtown New Haven and its social life.
- The campus has a very diversified student population.
- The new student center is a great addition to campus.

## SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES

### *Advising:*

- For undergraduates, with few exceptions the quality of the Advising function was *consistently* rated *extremely low* among the focus groups, both in the first two years of general advising as well as departmental advising.
  - numerous instances were stated of students extending their semesters required to graduate due to making up requirements needed, or losing graduation credit for courses taken that were not needed
  - using students as advisors in the initial semesters was deemed ineffective, as they are not qualified or knowledgeable enough no matter how well-intentioned
  - information on graduation requirements was seen as not easily available, although the new automated graduation report was seen as promising (not widely in use and/or understood at this time)
  - there is a lack of communication from the administration about policies, changes, etc.
  - much advising was seen as just a perfunctory process sufficient for students to register for courses of their own choosing, whether well-informed or not; one just goes to your advisor to get your PIN to register
  - it is very difficult for students to develop a personal relationship with their advisor; many students felt they were just a number, with no engaged time, just thrown into classes
  - a number of faculty give the impression that they are *forced* to do advising (“If we are not paid more, we are not going to spend time with students; it’s *your* job to figure out your schedule.”)
  - if there is a problem with your advising, you are pretty much stuck with it; there is nowhere else to go
  - there is little to no career advising built into the academic advising
  - more specialized advising is needed for the *non-traditional student* needs
  - previous proposals to change the advising program have gone nowhere

### *Faculty/Academics:*

- Faculty have posted office hours, but it is limited time for a large number of students among many other faculty responsibilities, so it can be very difficult to engage in any personal time with them.
- There is minimal out-of-class time spent with faculty members; faculty come into class, talk, and leave.
- Where a faculty member is weak, s/he is typically *very* weak in knowledge, teaching skills, or outright hostility to students; these faculty present a significant problem in learning.
  - too many faculty just read the book or write on the blackboard, without any creative interaction between teacher and students or being responsive to different learning styles

- complaints about faculty problems do not seem to result in any change, either with assisting in resolving short-term classroom difficulties or effecting long-term change for future students
- the faculty evaluation form done by students each semester does not seem to result in any meaningful change; the forms are just ignored
- strong academic knowledge of some faculty do not translate into good teaching skills
- There are some significant problems with course availability, especially at the graduate levels, with instances of required courses not being available (e.g. only available every two years), causing serious problems regarding time-to-graduate; 5-6 years to graduate due to course availability/scheduling issues is becoming far too standard.
- There does not seem to be much emphasis or opportunity for group projects, either in-class or out of the classroom; some of this seems to be the teacher's lack of interest in developing these opportunities, and some is limited by commuter schedules and logistics.
- Is there a real graduate program?
  - there is no real research being done, just the master's work
  - graduate classes have undergraduates in them, and the teacher winds up teaching to the undergraduates

*Technology:*

- Students are not engaging technology as part of their learning.
- There does not seem to be much use of classroom technology in the faculty lectures; many faculty do not seem to know how to use the equipment installed.
- There does not seem to be an effort to also expose students to the current technologies being used in their future jobs and careers.
- The library was seen as the only resource available to students to help them with their technology questions and problems.
- Some teachers require *all* homework to be online, but not all students have access to computers ("chalkboards still have a place").
- More and more tests are being done on computers, but there are no resources available for training or skill development for this kind of testing; online testing does not provide for *feedback* from the professor out of the test, just the score.

*Student Services:*

- Student administrative services (e.g. Wintergreen Hall) were *consistently* rated very low by most all students:
  - students do not know who does what, making it hard to know where to go to resolve your needs
  - processes are very convoluted, difficult to understand
  - processes change seemingly arbitrarily without advance announcement
  - personnel appear to be very disinterested in student needs and interact with students poorly

- students are sent back and forth from office to office multiple times to get things done, with incorrect information, and a great deal of finger-pointing
- it is almost impossible to do business with these offices over the phone versus being in-person to advocate for yourself
- The technologies being used for student services are improving and getting easier to use; but many are still dated, behind the times, and cumbersome.
- Student workers [in these offices] are more helpful and courteous than the adult staff.
- More staff is needed in the Bursar's Office during peak periods.

*Campus Life:*

- Student life and support services seem to be a priority for Southern, but the outcomes have very mixed results, particularly with support for commuter students.
- Food services were *severely* criticized (particularly in Connecticut Hall) more than one might expect, were seen as worse than in the past, and not on par with food programs and offerings at other universities.
- Parking is very difficult, both quantitatively and at the locations available, especially for commuter students.
- There is very little to do on campus; the student center is not open extended hours; it is a "suitcase campus" environment; this probably will not change unless Southern gets more out-of-state students here.
- Residential Life personnel are "too comfortable in their jobs," holding students in check but no one holding them accountable; rules and procedures are changed arbitrarily with no apparent reason and no advance announcements.
- Residential Life is not good for graduate students; the emphasis is on undergraduates, not graduates
- There is a lack of services and orientation programs available to assist new students in adapting to college life, managing their time, alcohol, etc., or helping them once they experience difficulties.

*Other weaknesses noted were:*

- Campus shuttle to off-campus locations is not adequate.
- Science and technology labs are behind, not using real-world equipment.
- There is a lack of support services in general for commuter students.
- School spirit and involvement is not very strong, a result of the large commuter population.
- There is a lack of *effective* communication about events on campus.
- Need *more* recreational facilities, and *extended access* to the facilities that do exist.

PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE

- Fix the Advising program.

- Improve student administrative services.
- Improve the food services.
- Spend more time with incoming students to help them get off to a right start.
- Put more emphasis, and expectation of standards, on the graduate programs; graduate students are becoming more of the campus's population.
- Improve course accessibility at graduate levels.
- Provide better recruitment information about programs, especially where pre-majors are required.
- Upgrade science and technology labs.
- Provide more community outreach.
- Improve parking/shuttle facilities, especially for commuter students.

### SELECTED QUOTES

- "I got what I wanted from Southern, but I went out and got it."
- "Will anything come of this planning process? We sit in these kinds of sessions and talk, but nothing ever comes of it."
- "The bureaucracy is bewildering."
- "I don't know what technology tools are being used in my [intended] profession, so I don't know if I am getting exposed to them or not. Southern needs to look at national standards for using technology."
- "There are some *amazing* professors here, who perform well over and above expectations. And then there are some who just don't care."
- "There is a new energy on campus, moving in right directions, which is great to see."
- "Southern used to be the 'fall back' school, but now it is becoming more competitive, which is good for all of us."
- "Once you start to get into academic or personal trouble, there are not good resources available to help you. Friends and a few faculty and staff helped me out. I'm still not back yet"
- "Southern is what you make of it, because they don't really help you."
- "Southern is opening doors for me. There is a sense of respect for us."
- "Where we have issues and weaknesses, we are trying to address them. There is far less griping and criticism."

**APPENDIX E**

---

**Connecticut's Population Projections 1995 to 2025**

## **STATE POPULATION RANKINGS SUMMARY**

### **CONNECTICUT'S POPULATION PROJECTIONS: 1995 TO 2025**

#### OVERVIEW

- Connecticut had a population of 3.3 million people in 1995. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, the state ranked as the 28th most populous. By 2000, it is projected to be the 29th most populous with 3.3 million people. By 2025, it is projected to be the 29th most populous with 3.7 million people.
- Over the three decades, Connecticut's total population is expected to increase 464 thousand people. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, the state's net gain ranks as the 35th largest. Its rate of population change, at 14.2 percent, ranks as the 40th largest. From 1995 to 2000, the state would have a net increase of 9 thousand people, which would rank as the 49th largest net gain in the nation.
- 1.2 percent of the nation's population resided in Connecticut in 1995 (ranked 28th largest among the 50 states and District of Columbia), compared with 1.2 percent in 2000 (ranked 29th) and 1.1 percent in 2025 (ranked 29th).
- Connecticut is expected to gain 337 thousand people through international migration between 1995 and 2025, placing it 12th largest among the net international migration gains among the 50 states and District of Columbia.
- Connecticut is projected to rank 43rd largest among the 50 states and District of Columbia in the number of persons gained through net internal migration between 1995 and 2025, losing 329 thousand persons.
- During the 1995 to 2025 period, Connecticut could have 1.4 million births and 992 thousand deaths. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, the state could rank 28<sup>th</sup> largest in births and 29<sup>th</sup> largest in deaths. It could rank 35<sup>th</sup> largest in terms of its natural increase (birth minus deaths).

#### AGE GROUPS

- The number and proportion of Connecticut's population that is aged 18 and over is expected to increase from 2.5 million or 75.6 percent in 1995 to 2.5 million or 75.9 percent in 2000. This population is expected to increase to 2.9 million or 77 percent in 2025.
- All states and the District of Columbia are projected to show a decline in the proportion of youth (under 20 years old) in their populations. The percentage of Connecticut's population classified as youth is projected to decrease from 26.6

percent in 1995 to 25.3 percent in 2025. Its rank among the 50 states and District of Columbia is expected to be the 45th largest proportion of youth in 1995 and the 29th largest proportion of youth in 2025.

- As the Baby Boom generation (those born between 1946 and 1964) reaches retirement age, the growth of the elderly population (65 and over) is expected to accelerate rapidly. The size of the elderly population is projected to increase in all states and the District of Columbia over the 30 year period. The proportion of Connecticut's population classified as elderly is expected to increase from 14.3 percent in 1995 to 18 percent in 2025. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, the state is projected to have the 9th highest proportion of elderly in 1995 and the 38th highest proportion of elderly in 2025.
- Connecticut's dependency ratio, the number of youth (under age 20) and elderly (ages 65 and over) there would be for every 100 people of working ages (20 to 64 years of age), could rise from 69.2 in 1995 to 76.4 in 2025. The 1995 and 2025 ratios rank the state as the 33rd largest and 46th largest, respectively, among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

#### RACE AND ETHNIC GROUPS

- By 2025, non-Hispanic Whites would comprise 69 percent of Connecticut's population, down from 82 percent in 1995. Non-Hispanic African Americans would comprise 11.1 percent of the state population in 2025, up from 8.4 percent in 1995. Non-Hispanic American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleut would comprise 0.2 percent of the 1995 state population and 0.2 percent of the 2025 state population. Non-Hispanic Asians and Pacific Islanders would increase from 1.9 percent of the 1995 state population to 4.3 percent of the 2025 state population. Persons of Hispanic origin, who may be of any race, is projected to increase from 7.5 percent of the 1995 state population to 15.4 percent of the 2025 state population.
- Between 1995 and 2025, the number of non-Hispanic Whites residing in Connecticut is projected to decrease by 105 thousand, compared to a gain of 142 thousand for non-Hispanic African Americans, a gain of 1 thousand for non-Hispanic American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleut, a gain of 99 thousand for the non-Hispanic Asians and Pacific Islanders, and a gain of 327 thousand for persons of Hispanic origin.
- The numeric change in Connecticut's non-Hispanic White population from 1995 to 2025 ranks as the 45th largest gain among the 50 states and District of Columbia. In the same period, the non-Hispanic African American population change ranks as the 24th largest gain, while the non-Hispanic American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut population change ranks as the 44th largest gain. The non-Hispanic Asian and Pacific Islander population change ranks as the 21st largest gain, while the Hispanic population change ranks as the 15th largest gain.

- During the 30 year period, Connecticut's non-Hispanic White population shrank by a rate of 3.9 percent. The non-Hispanic African American population grew by 51.6 percent, the non-Hispanic American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut population grew by 15.3 percent, the non-Hispanic Asian and Pacific Islander population grew by 158.7 percent, and the Hispanic population grew by 132.6 percent. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, the rate of growth for non-Hispanic Whites ranks 48th largest. The non-Hispanic African American growth rate ranks 25th largest, while the non-Hispanic American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut growth rate ranks 44th largest. The non-Hispanic Asian and Pacific Islander growth rate ranks 9th largest, while the Hispanic growth rate ranks 25th largest.
- The number and proportion of Connecticut's voting age population that is non-Hispanic White is projected to be 2 million or 82.2 percent in 2000. Comparable figures for the other race and ethnic groups are 200 thousand and 8 percent for non-Hispanic African Americans, 4 thousand and 0.2 percent for non-Hispanic American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleut, 54 thousand and 2.2 percent for non-Hispanic Asians and Pacific Islanders, and 186 thousand and 7.4 percent for persons of Hispanic origin.

*SOURCE OF DATA: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division, Population Paper Listing #47, Population Electronic Product #45.*

<http://www.census.gov/population/projections/state/9525rank/ctprsrel.txt>

Source of Report: Figures are from Series A (the Preferred Series) as reported in Campbell, Paul R., 1996, "Population Projections for States, by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2025," Report PPL-47, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division. Most of these data are available in files found on the Population Projections section of the World Wide Web's Census Bureau Home Page (<http://www.census.gov>).

## **APPENDIX F**

---

---

### **INSIGHTS INTO CONNECTICUT'S FUTURE ECONOMIC DIRECTION**

- Total employment in Connecticut is expected to increase by more than 150,000 or 8.5% over the 10-year period 2004 and 2014. In addition, another 420,000 workers will be needed to replace those that leave the workforce due to retirement or other reasons.
- Connecticut's industrial make-up, along with the rest of the nation, will continue its shift from a manufacturing-based to a service-based economy. By 2014, Connecticut's manufacturing industry will employ just under 10% of the workforce, higher than the 8.2% at the national level.
- All of the top ten industries expected to create the most new jobs during the projection period are found in the service sector. The education and health services sector will account for half of these industries and provide more than one-third of all new employment opportunities. Additionally, two of the top ten industries can be found in business and professional services, two in hospitality and food services, and one in financial services.
- Sixty percent of the twenty fastest growing occupations in Connecticut will require a minimum of a bachelor's or master's degree and command salaries in excess of \$75,000 annually. These occupations include: Computer Software Engineers, Network Systems Analysts, Personal Financial Advisors, and Physical Therapists. The remaining career opportunities will require some form of short/long-term training on the job or an associate's degree, and can earn salaries ranging from \$25,000-\$56,000 per year depending upon the position and job candidate's knowledge area and experience.
- As measured by the number of new jobs created, nearly half of Connecticut's leading careers will be management, professional and technical occupations. These include Healthcare Support and Practitioners (+14.5%, 13,700 new jobs), Business and Financial Operations (+12.6%, 11,500 new jobs), Management (+11.6% or 10,800 new jobs), Education and Training (+9.0%, 10,200 new jobs), and Computers and Mathematical occupations (+19% growth, 9,400 new jobs).
- Sales and Related occupations will generate 16,280 new jobs, followed by Food Preparation and Serving occupations, projected to grow nearly 15,000, and Personal Care and Services occupations, increasing by more than 9,000. Only Production occupations are expected to see reduction in their numbers, down slightly more than 4,000. However, replacement of workers who leave the workforce in this group will provide close to 3,000 jobs annually.

- When looking at total job openings, which include replacement workers, a majority will require only short-term on-the-job training for employment. This positive dynamic will open the door for numerous members (i.e., displaced workers, first-time workers) of our state's workforce looking to establish or reestablish a foothold in today's fast paced economy.
- According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Connecticut's per capita income rose over 5.5% from 2004-2005, eclipsing the national average of 4.6%. Examining both ends of the wage spectrum, occupations that call for advanced levels of education and professional degrees were paid more than those associated with less education and fewer skills in demand. For example, jobs requiring doctoral and/or professional degrees made on average more than \$110,000 annually and those needing only short-term on-the-job training earned just over \$25,000 per year.

Source: Labor Market Information, Office of Research, Connecticut Department of Labor, *Connecticut Forecast 2014*, <http://www.ctdol.state.ct.us/lmi/misc/forecast.ht>

## APPENDIX G

**CURRENT AND PROJECTED EMPLOYMENT by  
MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS**

Occupational Group	Employment 2004	Employment 2014	% Chg
Management Occupations	93,250	104,050	11.6
Professional and Technical Occupations	485,300	545,120	12.3
- Business & Financial Operations	91,740	103,270	12.6
- Computer and Mathematical	47,890	57,260	19.6
- Architecture and Engineering	39,940	42,140	5.5
- Life, Physical and Social Science	20,490	22,810	11.3
- Community and Social Services	31,990	37,440	17.0
- Legal	16,880	18,160	7.6
- Education, Training, and Library	113,070	123,270	9.0
- Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	28,550	32,280	13.1
- Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	94,750	108,490	14.5
Service Occupations	334,550	377,320	12.8
- Healthcare Support	50,700	59,050	16.5
- Protective Services	37,810	40,560	7.3
- Food Preparation and Serving Related	116,100	131,070	12.9
- Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	65,900	73,480	11.5
- Personal Care and Service	64,040	73,160	14.2
Sales and Related Occupations	198,420	214,700	8.2
Office and Administrative Support	300,310	308,310	2.7
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	4,960	5,200	4.8
Construction and Extraction	68,180	73,300	7.5
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	59,250	64,940	9.6
Production	119,190	115,100	-3.4
Transportation and Material Moving	97,290	102,840	5.7

Source: Labor Market Information, Office of Research, Connecticut Department of Labor, *Connecticut Forecast 2014*, <http://www.ctdol.state.ct.us/lmi/misc/forecast.ht>