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As I reflect on four years' work with the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, one of the chief emotions of which I am conscious is incredulity. It seems incredible that we as a society, that we as a university, could have taken so long to recognize and do something about our failure to extend the promise of this country to all its citizens. How could we have been blind for so long when it should have been clear that members of various minority groups as well as the female half of our population were in greater or lesser degree denied full participation in the society or its institutions?

At least part of the answer, perhaps, lies in the fact that for a long time most Americans believed that all members of society did have equal opportunity to participate and were participating to the limits of their talents. Because the melting pot did in fact work so well for so many, it was easier to believe there were none for whom it did not.

The melting pot implied a homogenization of the population which now is coming to be looked upon not only as an unrealistic goal but probably an undesirable one as well. Diversity is more and more seen as a source of strength, an enlivening and vitalizing force in the society.

Thus, the present period is not only one in which we have finally become aware of the ways in which we have failed to make the American dream a reality for all of our people; it also is a time in which we are questioning the old ideas about the kind of society we want. Rather than assuming that "e pluribus unum" requires the disappearance of minority elements into the larger body, we now begin the search for new and more imaginative ways of achieving the goal of "one out of many" without the elimination of diversity.

Universities, of course, do not function in isolation from the kinds of developments and changes in society which we are witnessing. Many of them have responded quickly and with imagination to the challenge presented by the new awareness. A pattern has been established and a course set which is unlikely to be reversed, in spite of the resistance and caviling which seem to be inevitable. The only question now seems to be how fast and how far can they go? To what extent are they willing and able to lead, rather than to follow?

As I see it, the University of Connecticut must rededicate itself, in the modern context and within its area of competence, to the goals of full and equal opportunity for all citizens and to the building of at least an intramural society in which diverse individuals and groups can live and function in respect and unity. I believe that the goals will not be reached until all members of the institution--faculty, staff, students, administration, and trustees--have come to accept them as legitimate and compelling.
The following account is an attempt to record the efforts of the University to expand human rights and opportunities during the period from mid-1968 to mid-1972, a period during which I was intimately involved as Chairman of the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities. The story is the story of the University, not the Council, although the Council had some part (and sometimes a big part) in much that took place. Being the account of a single participant, it is subject to the limitations of his perceptions, ability, and insight. Other persons who have been similarly involved would have seen things differently and should bear no responsibility for the errors of commission or omission of which I may be guilty.

My purpose in writing this history has been twofold: to record while the experience is still fresh a particular class of events, during an important period in the history of the University, and to provide what I hope will be helpful background for those who may become newly associated with the continuing effort to broaden and deepen the institution's contributions to human rights and opportunities.
INTRODUCTION

On April 4, 1968, an event occurred which was to have deep and lasting effects on the University of Connecticut: Martin Luther King, Jr. was murdered in Memphis, Tennessee. This tragic event gave impetus to profound changes which were to affect the institution significantly in the coming years, and it is with these changes that the present account is primarily concerned. As background for the story of the efforts to expand human rights and opportunities at the University of Connecticut, however, it may be helpful to describe briefly how things stood in the spring of 1968.

THE SITUATION IN THE SPRING OF 1968

Although as a public institution the University had always considered itself open to anyone who could qualify for admission, the fact is that it had been, as had most colleges and universities in the United States, essentially a white institution. To be sure, it had attempted to make itself available to the children of families of modest or even very limited means by keeping its costs low. It had never excluded a student for reasons of race. It had, in fact, had occasional black students or members of other minority groups enrolled, but the numbers were so small that for all practical purposes, it was a white university.

By the 1960's, however, a few people at Storrs were beginning to realize that the "open door" was not enough if a variety of factors discouraged people from coming through it. It began to be obvious that black students would have to be sought out and encouraged to come to the University. And in July 1966, William Trueheart, a young black graduate of the University was employed as the first black admissions officer in the history of the institution (in fact, the first black member of the administrative staff as a whole). By the spring of 1968, there were perhaps a few more than 100 black students enrolled.

In the area of employment conditions were no different. Although a number of racial minorities were represented among the professional and classified staff of the University, the number of individuals was small, and black persons in these ranks were almost unheard of.

For those black or otherwise disadvantaged students who might find themselves in need of special help or support, the services provided by the University for any student were of course available. However, there was little if any awareness of the fact that black students particularly, many of whom came out of inner city neighborhoods and schools, might have problems of adjustment different from those of the student body at large, and there was no attempt to provide special help for these special needs.

The situation at the time was, therefore, that black students were beginning to attend the University in somewhat larger numbers, but that few members of the institution had yet recognized that it might have
obligations to them which were different from those owed to the student body generally. This is not to say that many black students could not adjust and succeed, but they were required to do it almost completely without support. There were no faculty of their own race, there were no official counselors who might understand their special problems, and there was always the potential if not actual hostility of the overwhelmingly white environment.

In this situation it was no wonder that Trueheart and a few others taking graduate work were overwhelmed with counseling. At times it was almost impossible for them to carry on their own work, or even to get some private time to themselves, so great was the need of the undergraduate students to have some more mature person to talk to. The debt which the University owes to these dedicated individuals is not widely recognized.

It goes without saying, in view of the foregoing, that little if any thought had been given to the question of the treatment of black history or black culture in the educational programs of the University. Certain disciplines may have dealt with problems of minorities, but there was no widespread recognition throughout most areas of the institution that infusions of black history and black culture in the curriculum were needed by white as well as black students to assist them in understanding themselves and their society.

In all fairness, however, the picture was not one of complete insensitivity to the broad problem of minorities in higher education.* In the summer of 1967, nearly a year before the time now being examined, the University had begun two programs which were to grow over the next several years and make important contributions to the preparation of disadvantaged students to attend this and other universities. In addition, a third program in which ten disadvantaged freshmen were given special year-round academic and financial support at the Southeastern Branch was conducted on an experimental basis in the academic year 1967-68. It was not continued in the following year, and the students who had been involved were phased into the new "Summer Program" structure beginning to develop on the Storrs campus.

The Summer Program, the first of the two new programs started at Storrs in 1967, was designed to give entering freshman extra academic help during the summer before their first semester and to support them with advice and tutoring after their entrance into regular academic status. The program accommodated 19 students in the summer of 1967 and in April of 1968 was preparing to receive 40 for the summer.

The other program was "Connpep"—Connecticut Precollegiate Enrichment Program—an Upward Bound-type program, funded initially by the

*As early as the fall of 1963 President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. dealt with this subject in a speech at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education. He called attention to the need for a number of departures from tradition if the effort to extend meaningful educational opportunities to minority persons were to have any chance of success.
state and intended to discover promising high school students who needed motivation and academic help in order to be able to consider going on to college. Thirty young students who had finished their first year of high school were selected for the first year (1967) and a similar number added each year thereafter. The summer of '68 would see 60 Connep students on the campus for seven weeks of intensive work.

During the same period, the University had become one of the Connecticut institutions of higher learning cooperating with CONNTAC (Connecticut Talent Assistance Cooperative), an agency serving to guide disadvantaged youngsters to institutions which best meet their academic requirements and capabilities.

APRIL, 1968

For those who remember the day, it is not necessary to try to recreate the despair, confusion, and helplessness felt by millions of Americans, white as well as black, when Martin Luther King, Jr. died. For those who cannot remember, no account could convey the full depth of their feelings. Suffice it to say here, therefore, that the people of the academic community of Storrs, Connecticut, shared those feelings and were moved by them to action.

At the time, it seemed to many that this country had reached a level of depravity impossible to believe (though within a few months another incredible act of violence deepened the desperation already felt by many).

What was to become of a country which could harbor the murderer of the most respected and beloved spokesman for black aspirations? How could we continue to believe in the possibility of racial and social justice if a black leader who dared raise his voice could be brutally silenced? What kind of society, what kind of educational system, could produce such a madman as the killer of Martin Luther King and the not-much-less culpable millions who condoned or perhaps rejoiced in the act?

It was, in short, an emotional time.

Before the first shock of Dr. King's murder had worn off, a group of faculty and students, joined by others from outside the University, began a series of meetings which were to lead to the formation of an organization called CURE--Connecticut Union for the Revitalization of Education. In an atmosphere of crisis countless hours were devoted to hammering out a philosophy and a program. Dr. King had been shot on April 4, and by April 6 CURE was addressing a letter to the president of the University, urging a number of specific actions "... to change white attitudes by eradicating racial prejudice in the educational system both at the teacher training level, and in elementary and secondary schools."

In the days which followed, continued thought and discussion by the group resulted in a plan to bring the issue of educational reform to greater public attention. CURE developed and circulated a petition containing eleven major suggestions to the Board of Trustees; the
petition, signed by some 1,500 persons, detailed a number of steps which the University should take to combat racism within the institution as well as in the larger community of the state. And in a separate communication to the president, CURE proposed that the University establish an Institute of Race Relations to spearhead these and other efforts to help solve the racial crisis.*

While concerned members of the community were thus occupied, much thought was also being given by officials of the University to the same general question: What should be the response of the University to the crisis in the country? University President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. had been kept abreast of the thinking being developed across the campus and was in frequent and close communication with some of the members of the unofficial group. Largely through his foresight, the Board of Trustees was prepared to respond constructively to the petition of CURE, which was presented to it by a large and somber group of students and faculty on April 17.

Mr. Budds, the chairman, welcomed the interest and the help of the petitioning group and promised them the University's cooperation. He announced that the Board had at its meeting that day decided to create a University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities,** and authorized a program of special leaves of absence for members of the faculty, to permit those with special concerns for the alleviation of social problems to "... devote their full time and energies to direct involvement in activities designed to improve community programs and attitudes relating to human rights and opportunities." He also announced the appointment of a new member of the Board of Trustees, Mr. William D. Waller, the first black trustee in the history of the University.

The new Council on Human Rights and Opportunities was, according to the charge by the Trustees, to evaluate the University's existing efforts directed toward improved human rights and opportunities, to formulate a general policy for consideration by the Board of Trustees describing an appropriate role of active involvement for the University in the area of human rights and opportunities, to help heighten awareness throughout the University of the urgency of problems in the area of human rights and opportunities, and to propose and encourage the development of new and additional programs.***

To say that the new Council was welcomed warmly by all the members of CURE or of the campus community would be an exaggeration. To some, it appeared to be an attempt to deal with an urgent problem by appointing a committee which, regardless of good intentions, would by its very nature be incapable of expeditious action. To others, it suggested the possibility that the administration of the University was cynically trying to create the impression of constructive action while really wanting to bury the problem by assigning it to an impotent debating society. Though it is not possible to determine the extent to which some degree of skepticism permeated the entire membership of the organization, it is a fact that on April 19, the steering committee of CURE made public its decision not to accept representation on the Executive Board.

*The petition and the proposal regarding the Institute of Race Relations appear as Appendixes A and B.
**Originally called the "Council on the University's Concern for Human Rights and Opportunities."
***See Appendix C.
Committee of the Council, which had been offered by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees when he announced the formation of the Council. Subsequently, however, two members of the CURE leadership group did decide to join the Executive Committee.*

I remember attending a meeting of CURE on Sunday, April 21, 1968, at the Community House. It was my first meeting, since I had been away from the campus when the recent events had begun. I had not been prepared for the cynicism with which some speakers treated the Council, which had been announced only three days before but not yet formed. It seemed to be a fairly widespread view that the creation of the Council was a trick by the president to neutralize the drive of CURE and that it would be a mistake for any members of the group to get entangled in that snare. For some reason the assumption that the administration and the president were opposed to CURE and its objectives seemed to have wide currency in the group.

Some of the members of the steering committee, however, who knew who the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council was to be, though no public announcement had yet been made, informed the meeting that they were sufficiently satisfied with his "social commitment" to be willing at least to give the Council a chance. They proposed, therefore, that any individuals in CURE who might be invited to join the University Council be given the freedom to do so, with the understanding that they would immediately withdraw if the Council proved to be the delusion many obviously expected it to be. I must confess that I had mixed feelings on hearing my "social commitment" certified by these young people under these conditions.

Although CURE continued in existence for some months, it gradually became less active as the atmosphere of crisis diminished and as its original key people either left the University, became involved in other aspects of the struggle for human rights and opportunities, or became too involved in other types of activities to be able to keep up the single-minded devotion to CURE's work which had characterized its early months. The group had, however, made a contribution to the University community during its relatively short period of activity. Although it would be difficult to measure that contribution, there seems little doubt that CURE's influence had a good deal to do with the nature and speed of the University's official reaction to the crisis following Martin Luther King's death. If in no other way, it at least made it clear that there was widespread and strong sentiment within the University community for strong action. This no doubt encouraged the administration to take the steps which it did.

*Thornell T. Jones and Steven W. Welch
CURE was fortunate to attract a responsible membership, which soon developed a sensible line of reasoning to give direction and point to its planning. Their basic assumption was that in order to change the practices and features of our society which have served to hold the black man down, white attitudes must be changed. It was further assumed that white attitudes can be changed through education, or that education can at least make an important contribution toward that end. From these beginnings CURE's proposals developed: To change the educational system in ways which would enable it to combat white racism both at the institutional and personal levels. Realistically, their analysis concerned itself with what could be accomplished by a single institution—the University of Connecticut. In contrast to some of the educational "reform" movements which were to spring up in the following year or two, the proposals for action and change made by CURE were logically related to the goals which it had set forth for the University and for the society. The changes which the University was called upon to make in its own functioning, and the contributions which it was urged to make to the state-wide community, were consistent with its mission and appropriate to its field of competence. They were not, in other words, logical impossibilities, although they might in some cases have been practical impossibilities at that time and place.

THE COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

As originally conceived, the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities was to be a broadly representative body, comprising not only members of the University community, but also persons from outside. The President of the University, with advice from a number of quarters, invited thirty-nine persons to join the Council and designated six of them to serve as an executive committee.* A full time senior member of the faculty who happened to be on sabbatical leave at the time and thus not burdened with current teaching or administrative assignments, was appointed Chairman of the Council and of the Executive Committee. He was able to devote himself full time to the work of the Council as it developed. The Board of Trustees had, as an interim measure, appropriated $25,000 from the Continuing Education Reserve Fund for the use of the Council and provided, in addition, office space and a full time secretary.

On April 18, 1968, the Trustees' action in forming the Council was announced in the press; by April 20 the job of Chairman had been filled; and on April 24 the Executive Committee held its first meeting, with the first meeting of the whole Council taking place on the following day.

Which Way is Forward? Looking for Direction

The new Council came into existence at a time of real ferment. Ideas abounded concerning what the University could and should do in the face of the crisis. The suggestions which flooded into the office

*See Appendixes D & E for membership. The Executive Committee included David A. Ivry, director of CONNPEP; Thorneill T. Jones, graduate student in Physics; Lawrence L. Parrish, professor of Industrial Administration, chairman; William E. Trueheart, special assistant to the president of the University; Steven W. Welch, assistant professor of Economics; and William A. Wilson, professor of Psychology.
of the Council revealed, not surprisingly, a wide range of opinion about a university's objectives, functions, and priorities. And this confusion of views was reflected in the discussions in which the Council now became involved.

This point was vividly brought out in the first meeting of the Council, on April 25. At its meeting the previous day the Executive Committee had discussed the need for a quick start by the University in the development of black studies and had come to the conclusion that the only thing it could do on short notice without planning and without funds was to support the already-launched efforts of the history department to secure authorization for the hiring of a new person, preferably black, to teach in the field of black history. In pursuance of this thought, the Committee had prepared a resolution for the Council's attention, calling on the administration to make funds available to the history department. I think most of us were a bit taken aback when a couple of representatives from the Law School were strongly critical of this action -- "when people are starving in the ghettos."

Right there were revealed basic differences of opinion on what was proper for a university to undertake, what was feasible for a university to do, what the university's obligations were and to whom they were owed, and what priorities should govern, both in terms of time and distribution of the institution's scarce resources.

Within a very short time it became clear that sensible planning was impossible without some agreement on a conception of the University's goals and priorities in the field of human rights and opportunities. The Executive Committee was instructed by the Council at its second meeting on May 7, 1968, to prepare a statement of long range goals and objectives for its consideration. The Committee proceeded to do this, and by dint of much talk and difficult thinking, the Council at its meeting of July 16, approved the final version of the presentation of its views. This document (which is reproduced in Appendix F) was forwarded to the president for presentation to the Board of Trustees at its meeting of September 18, 1968.

Although the statement dealt in general terms with the responsibilities, potentialities, limitations, and priorities of the University in relation to human rights and opportunities, its conclusions concerning objectives and the means which might be used to reach them are of greatest interest at this point. The "Objectives of the University in the Areas of Human Rights and Opportunities" were asserted to be:

"1. To develop within the University a climate of respect, tolerance, and acceptance in which all individuals and groups interact without regard to racial, ethnic, or
social differences.

"2. To expand educational, social, economic, and cultural opportunities in the University for minority and disadvantaged students.

"3. To expand opportunities for employment of members of minority and disadvantaged groups throughout the University.

"4. To assist in the amelioration or solution of social problems outside the University--local communities, State of Connecticut, beyond.

"5. To foster study and research on the problems of minority groups and on human rights and opportunities in American Society."

At the time it was obvious to everyone, as the wording of these objectives makes clear, that the Council was thinking about "human rights and opportunities" in relation to a rather specific and limited segment of the population--the disadvantaged minorities: black, Spanish speaking, and poverty-level white youths. Operationally, this meant mostly members of the black population, though attention was also being given to the needs of other minority groups.

Universities generally, and this University in particular, had always believed themselves to be contributing to the enhancement of human rights and opportunities, at least through their traditional functions of discovering and transmitting knowledge. And as a land grant institution, the University of Connecticut had always specifically included in its own definition of its mission, "service to the State." This concept had for many years found its major expression in service to the agricultural and, to a lesser extent, industrial sectors of the state's economy. It had not, in a conscious and specific sense, been taken to mean direct service to the poor, the disadvantaged, or the Blacks as separately identifiable urban groups, though the Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources had already begun to develop the capacity and the resolve to serve urban as well as rural people.

It must be understood, therefore, that the statement of objectives did not imply that the institution had not previously dealt with human rights and opportunities or that the traditional concept of service had lost its validity. It was saying, however, that the previous definition had to be broadened to include groups and problems which had not been given sufficient attention within the traditional framework and that these newly-interpreted objectives demanded immediate and massive attention.

The Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, therefore, proceeded to seek ways to stimulate action by the institution and its component units, to influence their thinking, and to provide them with whatever help it could. In the following pages a general review of the action will be undertaken for the four years from the spring of 1968 to the spring of 1972.*

*The full Council was active for only about a year and ceased meeting in the fall of 1969. It was formally disbanded in November 1970. The Executive Committee thus became, in effect, the Council. Its membership was increased to nine in the fall of 1972.
HOW TO REACH THE OBJECTIVES?

The job of deciding in general terms what the University should try to accomplish in the field of human rights and opportunities was a relatively easy one. But once the objectives had been set, the problem of how to reach them had to be faced, and it was not simple. Although the statement of long range objectives, described above, had listed a number of "possible means" for the accomplishment of these objectives,* it was not always clear which, if any, of the suggested approaches would work, which were the most promising, or which were feasible. And these were not the only questions which had to be faced; how to do these things was also far from clear in many cases. Even given full acceptance of the objectives on the part of every member of the institution, there was still almost certain to be a host of obscure and frustrating problems in moving such a large and complex organization in the new directions.

Given this situation, and considering, too, the urgency of the task and the limitations of time and energy which could be devoted to it, it is not surprising that false starts were made and experiments tried which turned out to be ineffective or only partially successful. In spite of the groping nature of the efforts, however, much has been done. That is, there have been a lot of effort expended, new programs and approaches devised and implemented, and many changes effected; but because of the imponderable nature of the objectives, it is difficult to measure how far this action has carried us toward their fulfillment. Nevertheless, it should be helpful to review what has been done in the effort to move ahead.

At this point the reader should take notice of what to expect next. In the first place, the proposed review is likely to be long, somewhat detailed and, I suspect, rather tiresome for the reader with only a casual interest. And yet, the really serious reader may be disappointed to find that the discussion in numerous cases is brief and general, while he might wish to have more information on which to base an opinion.

The first is advised to skim the following sections by reading the numbered paragraph headings under each of the objectives and continuing if his curiosity is aroused. This will at least give him an idea of what has been going on. The reader desiring more information than he can find here about a given program is urged to talk to those associated with the actual operation of the activity in question. They are in a position to give the greatest insight and the most current information, as well as to benefit from the suggestions which interested outsiders might be moved to offer.

*See Appendix F.
Finally, let me point out that in each area of action an attempt has been made to describe what has actually been done and, to the extent possible, what the objective results were. It will be remembered that when the original analysis was made by the Council it was reasoned that each of the actions proposed would contribute to the achievement of the objective with which it was associated. It would, therefore, be desirable to evaluate the extent to which the actions did indeed move the institution toward those objectives, but this has not been attempted except in the most general way. This is because, in many cases, the contribution of a given effort to the objective is impossible to measure or, in others, could only be determined by a much more far-reaching and complex analysis than it has been possible to perform.

Objective 1: "To develop within the University a climate of respect, tolerance, and acceptance in which all individuals and groups interact without regard to racial, ethnic, or social differences."

(1) **By increasing numbers of minority students.** As noted earlier, the number of black students enrolled in 1967-68 was slightly over 100. It is impossible to determine the number with certainty, since the University does not ask students for information about their race, and this information is therefore not available through any official or completely reliable source. Best estimates of the number of black students in subsequent years are: 1968-69--170; 1969-70--350; 1970-71--550; 1971-72--660.

Although efforts to recruit Spanish-speaking students had commenced as early as 1966, the results were not very satisfying for several years. Eventually, however, gains were made in this area and are expected to continue. According to a leader of the Puerto Rican student organization, there were 67 Puerto Ricans in the undergraduate population in the fall of 1971. This was an increase from perhaps less than ten, two years earlier.

(2) **By modifications and new developments in course offerings and curricula.** Early in the year 1969 a committee was formed by the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to consider the place of black studies in the University. By the spring, a report was ready in which the formation of a Center for Black Studies was recommended. Following approval by the Board of Trustees, the new center was established on July 1, 1969.

The nature of the Center reflects the decisions reached by the committee which recommended its formation: that it function to stimulate, encourage, and coordinate the development of new academic offerings in the general field of black studies by appropriate departments throughout the institution. It was to take this approach rather than acting itself to develop a new field of study, a new department, or a new and distinct academic major. Students were to be
given the opportunity to take considerable work in courses dealing with the black experience or the black perspective, but would continue to major in a traditional discipline.

With the advice and assistance of Dr. Floyd Bass, the director of the Center, various departments proceeded to explore ways to introduce black perspectives into existing courses as well as possibilities for new courses dealing more directly with black perspectives and experience. At the same time, the University Senate authorized a more flexible approach to the development and introduction of experimental new courses. The result was to speed up the process of getting so-called black studies courses into operation and to encourage experimentation in this new and not-yet-well-defined area.

The results of the foregoing actions in terms of new courses developed and numbers of students exposed to new perspectives in their studies are easier to state than to evaluate. As is so often true, a factual description of what actually took place is subject to differing interpretations according to the reader's view of what should have taken place or expectation of what would take place. Moreover, it is probably impossible to measure, and thus unwise to speculate about the most important thing of all—the impact of this kind of academic work on the attitudes and behavior of the students exposed to it and upon the racial climate in the University. One can only hope that in these terms the results have been beneficial. Let it be clear, therefore, that the following summary of events is not intended to convey or to induce a feeling either of satisfaction or of dissatisfaction with what has been accomplished.

In the absence of collected information about courses and enrollments in black studies, it was necessary to go to the University Catalog for 1971-72 to find courses dealing with, (1) minority groups in a general sense, (2) Africa, or (3) Afro-American culture or history. Fourteen such courses were found; they are listed herewith according to the timing of their appearance.

Courses in 1967-68 Catalog

Pol. Sci. 323 Developing Countries in International Politics, with special attention to Africa.
Soc. 240 Minority Groups.
Soc. 342 Majority-Minority Group Relations.

Additional Courses in 1968-69 Catalog (Presumably adopted by department before December 1967)

Anthro. 223 Peoples of Africa.

Additional Courses in 1969-70 Catalog (Presumably adopted by departments before December 1968)

Hist. 238 The Negro in American History, subsequently changed to The History of Black Americans.
Pol. Sci. 239 Politics in Africa
Soc. 241 Afro-American Culture
Additional Courses in 1970-71 Catalog (Presumably adopted by departments before December 1969)

English 276 Black American Writers
Pol. Sci. 233 Political Systems of Southern Africa

Additional Courses in 1971-72 Catalog (Presumably adopted by departments before December 1970)

Anthro. 225 Contemporary Africa
Hist. 246 The Black Experience in 20th Century America
Hist. 339 Topics in Black History
Hist. 448 Research Seminar in Black History
Pol. Sci. 339 Seminar in African Politics

It will be noted that of these 14 courses, three were available before the assassination of Martin Luther King, one was ready to be offered, and ten were introduced subsequently. Seven had been adopted before the formation of the Center for Black Studies in July 1969, and seven were introduced after that time.

Some of these courses had not actually been offered by the spring of 1972, while others appeared to have found their places in the regular offerings of their departments. In addition, at least four new courses which were not ready for inclusion in the 1971-72 catalog were ready to be given and were included in departmental offerings during that academic year. Among these were two in Family Relations and Child Development: "Socially Disadvantaged Families" (CDFR 270) and the "Black American Family Patterns" (CDFR 271). Also, two courses in the School of Fine Arts were moved into permanent status in that school's offerings from their experimental beginnings as Interdepartmental 195C, which had been offered in several previous semesters. They are identified as Fine Arts 181 and 182, "The Black Experience in the Arts."

The foregoing courses were designed and adopted in accordance with the normal procedures governing the introduction of new courses. In addition, new offerings in the area of black studies were made available under liberalized procedures approved by the University Senate. In this category the following experimental courses were given from one to three times during the past several years under the sponsorship of the departments shown. As already noted, two Fine Arts courses have evolved into permanent offerings from these experiments.

Interdepartmental 195A1, Black Politics in Contemporary America Political Science
Interdepartmental 195B1, Black Institutions in White America Anthropology
Interdepartmental 195C1, The Black Experience in the Arts Fine Arts
Interdepartmental 195D1, The Black Experience in Relationship to Education Education
Though the following figures may not be absolutely accurate, for the present purposes they give a sufficiently reliable indication of the enrollment in the courses which have been enumerated above, both the regular departmental and the interdepartmental courses. The numbers shown represent the total number of students registered for all courses in the area of black studies as that field was defined earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>2744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>2103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without knowing the number of black studies courses taken by each student, it is possible only to speculate about the number of students represented by these enrollments. For example, if each person who took black studies courses in the year 1971-72 took two, then there were just over 1050 students involved, while twice that number were involved if each of them took only one during the year. In any case, it is probably safe to assert that many hundreds of students, if not several thousand, have been exposed to some aspect of the black studies field during the past four years at the University. Some large fraction of these were bound to be white students who, it must be hoped, have had their understanding and knowledge of the black experience and black culture expanded. Many black students, too, must have come to a greater appreciation of their backgrounds and culture.

(3) The Student Involvement Program. In its first summer of activity (1968) the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities launched this new program with several thousand dollars of the money initially provided by the Board of Trustees. As originally conceived, the Student Involvement Program was designed to encourage white students to engage in summer activities which would be of service to disadvantaged people and at the same time educational for the student themselves. In that summer the students were given grants of $500 for ten weeks of work with community agencies in a number of Connecticut cities. The purpose of the grant was to make it possible for students who needed
to make some money, but not necessarily to maximize their earnings, to engage in socially useful work.

Twenty students volunteered as the result of an article in the daily Campus and were able to secure suitable appointments for the summer. Their contributions to the inner-city agencies for which they worked were enthusiastically received and proved of great value to the students themselves. A number of students changed their career plans as a result of their experiences and hoped, in consequence, to be more socially productive in the years to come than they otherwise might have been. It was also assumed that the new understanding of the problems and attitudes of minorities by the students who engaged in this activity would be transmitted to other members of the student body upon their return to campus. This, it was hoped, would make some contribution to the development of a more enlightened atmosphere in the student body of the institution. No measurement of this anticipated contribution was attempted, however.

The program was again offered in the summer of 1969, with University money being used to subsidize a group of 21 white students, this time at a rate of $600 per person for the ten-week summer. In the meantime, however, it had been decided that similar opportunities should be opened up for students who could not get along on the very modest grants which the Council had been able to finance from University funds. In consequence, an additional group of students was recruited from among those eligible to receive work-study funds. For this purpose a plan was devised in cooperation with the admissions department to employ black students to return to their own home neighborhoods to work in community organizations which would bring them into close contact throughout the summer with young teenagers. The overall objective of the students thus employed was to contribute to the long range efforts of the University to recruit students from minority groups by attempting through their own example, as well as by program activities throughout the summer, to motivate the youngsters to remain in high school and to prepare themselves for post-secondary education. It was expected, of course, that many of them would become interested in applying to the University of Connecticut at the appropriate time. For this aspect of the Student Involvement Program 36 black students were secured, raising the total enrollment in the two phases of the program to 57 in 1969.

By the summer of 1970 University funds for this program were no longer available, so that all participants had to be eligible for work-study. Sixty-two black students and two whites were enrolled. In 1971, despite threatened cuts in work study funds by the federal government, the financial aid office managed to find sufficient funds to allow 58 black students to participate. In each of these last three years the students on work-study were able to earn in the neighborhood of $1,200 for their summer's work and to provide enormous help to the hard-pressed community agencies where they served, which were not required to pay for their services. It is, of course, difficult to determine what impact their efforts eventually will have on the recruitment efforts of this institution or on the rate of college attendance among the balck youngsters who have come under their influence.

(4) The Community Involvement Program. When the Board of Trustees
announced the formation of the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, it also introduced the Community Involvement Program. This offered the opportunity to faculty members to secure paid leaves of absence from the University in order to work in community-related activities for the purpose of advancing human rights and opportunities.

The Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, at the request of the president, proceeded to develop guidelines for the administration of the program and undertook to assist interested faculty members to locate appropriate affiliations and activities for periods of one semester or one year. During the academic year 1968-69 six members of the faculty took advantage of the program to perform what seem to have been worthwhile activities in a variety of settings. These leaves were as follows:

1. Brian Klitz, Music Department. Part-time leave first semester, nearly full-time leave second semester to work with Narcotics Addiction Research and Community Opportunities (NARCO) in New Haven. His major task was research, planning and development work leading to the creation of an educational program on drug addiction.

2. Neil O. Littlefield, School of Law. Part-time leave spread over both semesters working with the Neighborhood Legal Services Center in the North End of Hartford, specializing in consumer law problems.

3. Gerald Sazama, Economics Department. Part-time leave during second semester to work with local groups in Willimantic in an approach to the rehabilitation of substandard housing.

4. James Scully, English Department. Full-time leave during second semester to work in the Matthew Project ("Street Academy") in Hartford. This project aims to reinvolve high school dropouts in the educational process by interesting them in an informal educational venture.

5. Michael Simon, Philosophy Department. Full-time leave during the second semester to work as coordinator and expediter for the Hartford Office of the NAACP.

6. Donald Weckstein, School of Law. Part-time leave during first semester to aid the Department of Community Affairs in legislative research and drafting in preparation for the 1969 session of the General Assembly.

Essentially, it was expected that these leaves of absence would accomplish three things: faculty members would have an opportunity to
learn about some of the problems of minority and disadvantaged people from first hand experience, and this greater understanding would be transmitted to their colleagues and students upon their return to the campus, thus contributing to the development of a more understanding climate throughout the institution; valuable services to a community would be rendered by the faculty member taking advantage of the opportunity; the members of the faculty who had strong motivation to help solve or ameliorate social problems would be permitted to satisfy this need by being freed from their duties at the University while continuing to receive their regular salaries for the period of the leave.

Though the program was received with enthusiasm and a number of leaves actually taken during its first year, interest soon waned, and by the following academic year inquiries about leaves had fallen off drastically. One leave was approved for 1969-70, but the faculty member who was to have been involved left the University before being able to take advantage of it, and since then no CIP leaves have been requested.

In view of the innovative and promising nature of the program, it is interesting to speculate on the reasons for its decline. One factor which undoubtedly played a part was the absence of adequate financial resources for hiring replacements for faculty members proposing to be away from their regular duties for a semester or a year. This problem may have been more apparent than real, since in the first year of operation Provost Edward V. Gant was able to find sufficient funds to permit the hiring of some replacements, but the uncertainty of being able to continue this practice may well have led many faculty members to be reluctant to propose to leave their teaching and other duties to be handled by their colleagues. And although the administration of the University tried, in subsequent budget submissions, to secure extra funds to back up the Community Involvement Program, these efforts proved unsuccessful.

It seems likely, in addition, that as the atmosphere of urgency of the spring of 1968 receded, faculty members found it easier to immerse themselves in the accustomed concerns of their professional lives and more difficult to contemplate breaking out of that pattern. And, finally, it should be noted that some apprehensions had developed among younger faculty members that their long-run career prospects would be jeopardized by taking time off from their regular pursuits and reducing the time available to enhance their professional standing.

I hated to see this program fade so quickly and so completely. It had great potential in a number of ways—for the individual, the University, and society. Assuming that the lack of ability to finance it was an important factor in its failure, it probably does not make much sense to try to revive it until this problem can be handled satisfactorily. If at some future date it should become possible to start up again, perhaps on a less ambitious scale, careful thought should be given to the relationship of participation in the program to career progress.
It was never intended, of course, that participation in the program would make any direct and measurable contribution to a faculty member's advancement in his profession as a teacher or researcher, even though there was every reason to suppose that it would, by enriching his experience, enable him to broaden and deepen his contribution to the educational processes of the institution. Even so, it would seem desirable to seek ways of assuring potential participants that their advancement in the University would at least not be retarded.

(5) Cultural Activities. It is widely supposed that knowledge and appreciation of the cultures of other countries leads to greater international understanding, tolerance and acceptance of differences. In like manner, it may be supposed that a predominantly white middle class institution such as the University will grow in understanding and acceptance of diversity by being exposed to the cultures of its minority members. Although no inventory of cultural events oriented in this direction exists, it is possible to say that in the period under consideration--1968 to 1972--many programs have been offered on the campus designed to educate, inform and entertain both the black and the white members of the community. Dance, music, art, literature, social criticism, religion, politics, and history have been dealt with by black speakers and artists from the black point of view. For those white members of the community who have taken advantage of these scores of opportunities, there is little doubt that there has been an increase in awareness understanding and appreciation of the role of black people in our society, the contributions they have made, and the problems they have faced. There is no way of knowing the extent of white participation in such activities, though with the exception of a few programs attendance has usually been disappointingly small. Consequently, the contribution of these kinds of activities to racial understanding and respect may have been real, but limited.

It is interesting to note that the rather striking increase in programs with black orientation took place, not as the result of a centrally directed or coordinated drive to increase "black" programming, but through the independent and largely uncoordinated decisions and actions of many components of the University community. Numerous academic departments scheduled speakers for classes or for departmental colloquia, the Student Union Board of Governors sponsored others, the Association of Religious Counselors at the University sponsored programs and brought in speakers, the management of the Auditorium contributed to the total, and, perhaps most importantly and most imaginatively, the black students themselves, through such organizations as the Afro-American Cultural Center and the Organization of Afro-American Students, enriched the total program mix made available to the community in the area of black culture and black experience by bringing in dance groups, speakers and performers. Black speakers shared in programs sponsored by ad hoc groups which organized protests and demonstrations during the period of high activity in the campaign against the war in Southeast Asia.
(6) Social Life. Objective data are not available to throw light on what changes, if any, have taken place in the social life of the University, and it would be difficult for a member of the community, whose participation in student life is minimal, to comment meaningfully on this subject. Certainly overt exclusion of black students from university affairs would be difficult to find, though covert actions of this sort may be suspected. Some observers have been disappointed that Blacks and Whites appear to go their separate ways in their extra-curricular activities, while at the same time understanding that this is natural so long as members of the two groups do not feel comfortable with each other. On the other hand, casual observation suggests that limited social intercourse does take place.

While it may be true that more frequent and more intimate social contacts between white and black students can make a contribution to the achievement of a more open climate of respect and acceptance on the campus, it may also be that a more thoroughly integrated social life will only be the result of the growth of an atmosphere of trust and tolerance, rather than its cause. This uncertainty about what is cause and what is effect, plus the fact that the social life of the students is by nature their own business, creates a situation in which direct official action by the University to promote a more integrated social life is not only unlikely to succeed, but also of questionable propriety. This is not intended to suggest, of course, that institutional policy regarding racial or other types of discrimination, for example, is inappropriate. Well before the period being considered in this discussion, the University had made and enforced clear policies regarding exclusive practices of fraternities and sororities.

(7) Training of employees, and (8) Orientation of students, employees, and faculty. For the purpose of this brief historical review it will be convenient to combine the discussion of these two subjects. Indeed, they are so closely related that it may have been improper to separate them in the original analysis.

The overwhelming majority of the white students, faculty members, and employees of the University of Connecticut probably has not had much exposure to black members of our society. And, in most cases, even those Whites who have been thrown with Blacks in school or place of work have not been prepared to understand their backgrounds or to recognize that their experience was different from that of the white majority. Thus, in the summer of 1968, while the institution was anticipating the influx of increasing numbers of black students in the years ahead, it seemed self-evident that the white population of the University was ill prepared to welcome the newcomers successfully. Acceptance of this assumption did not necessarily rest upon expectations of overt racial discrimination or hostility, though that possibility could not be ruled out. Rather, it seemed probably that the principal obstacle to a successful transition would be ignorance and lack of sensitivity to the needs and feelings of the Blacks. In the light of this projection, "orientation" and "training" were called for.

The only really massive effort undertaken along these lines has been during the annual freshman orientation week. The Division of
Student Personnel's Freshman Orientation Committee began planning in the spring of 1969 for the opening of the 1969-70 academic year, and that fall the orientation program placed heavy emphasis on the issue of race relations. Speeches and films were presented to the entire freshman class during one day of their orientation period, and in the evening every member of the class was assigned to a discussion group to consider the subject of Black-White relations. There were about 50 groups, and discussions were led by faculty members or by members of the professional staff in all freshman dormitories. Format and content varied according to the group, with results as reported by those participating varying from very good to poor.

Basically the same approach was used again in the fall of 1970, but in 1971 a different plan was adopted. This involved an evening concert by a group of black performers called The Voices, Inc. Their two hour program utilized song and dance as media for tracing the history of the black people from their origins in Africa, through the period of their enslavement and transportation to America, down to the present time. Also included in the schedule was a series of workshops, or discussion groups, held the next morning to offer opportunities to those who wanted to talk further about the ideas stimulated by the concert. From all reports the concert itself was superb and the message beautifully conveyed. The discussion groups, by contrast, were so poorly attended that, quantitatively speaking, they must be considered a failure, though the 30 students who attended may well have got a great deal out of them.

Following the Freshman Week program in the fall of 1969, the Division of Student Personnel and the Center for Black Studies, with the assistance of the Audio-Visual Center, organized the "Film Seminar Series" in an effort to reach sophomores, juniors, and seniors in the student population. Films, followed by discussion, were shown in 49 of the 96 dormitories on campus, and 647 of the 4,654 students residing in those 49 dormitories actually attended. In all, sixty discussion leaders, including students, faculty, and professional staff, took part in the program. Although results were mixed, the program was judged to have been moderately successful in generating interest among those who attended, but it was not repeated in subsequent years.

In addition to the officially sponsored efforts reported above, some other groups, including especially members of the Campus Christian Foundation have engaged in parallel activities. During the 1968-69 academic year and again in 1969-70 a number of film or tape discussions were conducted in residence halls, with the objective of sensitizing the white students and stimulating them to personal action aimed at the elimination of racism on the campus and in the wider society.

Another approach to training in the area of black-white relations, initiated about the same time and continuing in subsequent years, was the encounter group. "Laboratories" under the auspices of the Campus Christian Foundation have reached small numbers of students and faculty and continue to be offered up to the present. The University itself also made some efforts to encourage experimentation with this technique by contracting with McCall Associates of New York to engage in sensitivity training as well as to offer general advice on how to influence
racial attitudes of members of the academic community. During the academic year 1970-71 a number of laboratory sessions were held for faculty, students, administrators and staff, but the scope of the program was limited, and its impact was less than it might have been if more generous financing had been available.

One outgrowth of the McCall activity, however, was the formation of a group of faculty, staff, and graduate students called the Connecticut Trainers Association, whose objective was to continue the experimentation with human relations training in the University community. It was not clear, however, what impact this group was likely to have on racial attitudes. The organization consisted entirely of volunteers, its membership was all white, and was likely to turn over as its graduate student members left the institution, and there appeared to be, on the part of some of its members, greater interest in laboratory training as a technique than as an instrument for the improvement of racial attitudes and race relations.*

The activities described above were, it will be noted, aimed almost entirely at the student body, on the assumption that relations among white and black members of the student body are of major importance. Unfortunately, even though the need was recognized, a similar effort has not been developed with regard to members of the faculty and the professional and classified employees of the institution.

As one example, the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities feared that the experience of many faculty members had not equipped them to deal effectively with the new classroom situation which would probably develop with the presence of increasing numbers of minority students. It suspected, further, that many faculty members would not believe that this was true or that the classroom situation would be altered. The Council, however, never succeeded in designing an approach to this expected problem. It did initiate a meeting of the members of one department for the purpose of discussing the kinds of problems which might arise and considering what changes, if any, might be called for in the role of the teacher. For a variety of reasons, however, the effort was not carried further. For one thing, the success of the one experimental meeting was questionable, perhaps because of the Council's failure to define its purpose clearly and establish its format properly, perhaps because the whole effort was not perceived to be of compelling importance by the members of the department. For another, the possibility of reaching many members of the faculty through the work of the McCall group, referred to above, was in the offing, and it was decided to suspend further attempts under the direct aegis of the Council itself. As previously noted, however, the McCall program did not turn out to be as extensive as originally hoped, and the bulk of the faculty was not exposed to orientation of this sort.

The Personnel Services Division, which is responsible for the recruiting, employment, and maintenance of the classified work force of the University, has made a practice of holding orientation sessions for all new employees, though these efforts have been curtailed by the financial stringencies of the recent past. These sessions have not, in the past, included coverage of the subject of minority group relations, however. On the other hand, training courses for a few groups of supervisors have dealt with this subject. For example, all

*In December, 1971, the organization was reported to have disbanded.
supervisors in the mechanical trades were involved in a special seminar on the impact of the introduction of black and Puerto Rican workers into those trades in the University's physical plant department. A course for supervisors in food services was also presented, but beyond this not much has been attempted.

By the fall of 1971 all training activities had been suspended in response to the tight budget situation, which had led to the almost complete cessation of hiring and automatically reduced the entrance of new minority employees into the University. Plans are ready, however, to resume and expand this kind of activity when conditions permit. In addition, the need is recognized for special training of certain groups of employees whose work involves them in direct contact with students and whose relations with students, black or white, can play a big part in forming the attitudes of students toward the University and determining their feelings about their lives in the campus community. However, very little is in fact being done.

(9) Student, Faculty, and Administration Leadership. Here the reasoning was that one of the crucial forces shaping attitudes and contributing to the development of a better human relations climate in the institution would be leadership, one facet of which would be the public and private attitudes, actions, and statements of people in a position to influence others.

It is impossible, of course, for one observer to have witnessed all of the moments or incidents in which an act of leadership has contributed to or detracted from the development of the kind of climate to which the institution might aspire. Unfortunately, it is equally true that one's memory of a crowded period of several years is unable to yield up all the evidence which might be available. For this reason, a few comments must suffice, with perhaps an isolated illustration or two, but with no pretensions of completeness or balance on which an objective and reasonable evaluation of the quality of leadership could be based.

One recalls, for example, the Committee on Racism, a predominantly student group which undertook for a brief time in 1969 to develop evidence of personal or institutional racism and to suggest remedies. One of its more imaginative efforts was to call attention to the fact that at the time the ratio of black students in the University was lower than the ratio of black citizens to the total population of the state and to ask the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate the University on these grounds. Nothing was ever made public concerning the results of this request.

Throughout the period under review, student leadership, both black and white, was generally positive, responsible, and creative. The black student leaders, particularly, bore a heavy burden in times of calm and times of tension, and they generally bore it effectively and with dignity and responsibility. In reality, this University owes a debt of gratitude to those students who helped it see and understand the problems and to find solutions to them. They often did so at great sacrifice of time and energy and, no doubt, at considerable cost to their academic pursuits. And though white students were not so continuously involved, at times of crisis elected student leadership on
Lest the foregoing passages seem unrealistic, it must be said that such a glowing commentary would not be subscribed to by all observers. They would insist, and correctly so, that leadership at all levels was not always so strong as it should have been. (These comments, incidentally, are intended to refer to student and faculty leadership as well as administrative.) They would point out that most individuals have uneven records, even if their overall performance has been excellent. They would insist, perhaps sometimes with justification, perhaps not, that apparent acts of leadership are verbal, not active, that they are intended to produce a public impression, not action or change in the operation of the institution, and that the persons involved are motivated more by their personal or political aspirations than by real desire to advance the cause of human rights in the institution. In short, they sometimes question the sincerity even of those who appear most eager to contribute to the cause. It is impossible to say that they are always wrong; such things do happen. It is unrealistic, however, to assume on the basis of some preconception that all positive acts of leadership are designed to mislead. The record of accomplishment suggests, in fact, that on balance leadership in the University, and action stimulated by it, has been more positive than negative or neutral. And in the case of some individuals, few would deny that it has been consistently and strongly positive.

(10) **Expanded employment of minority persons.** To create an atmosphere in which black students could feel at ease, as well as for the benefit of the white university population, it was judged necessary to secure the services of larger numbers of black persons in faculty, administrative, and staff positions throughout the institution. Positive results in this area have been achieved, but a description of the effort to bring about the expansion will be deferred until later when that topic is brought up for separate consideration.

(11) **Lecture series, conferences, seminars.** At the time of its original effort to lay out a program for the University to "develop a climate of respect ..." the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities supposed that lectures and other types of programs would be effective aids to the desired end. It visualized the possibility that the Council itself would sponsor or organize lectures and conferences. In fact, however, the Council has done very little in this area on its own. Two factors help to explain this change of mind: The emergence of a widespread, spontaneous movement to program black speakers, artists, and performers, described earlier under the heading "Cultural Activities," and the unavailability to the Council of the kind of financial resources necessary to do a respectable job in such programming.

**Objective 2:** "To expand educational, social, economic, and cultural opportunities in the University for minority and disadvantaged students."

In the summer of 1968 when this objective was enunciated by the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, it appeared that action along the following lines might be necessary in order to move toward the objective: (1) Increased student financial aid; (2) More active recruiting of minority students by the institution; (3) Liberalization of admissions standards for students with inadequate preparation for higher education; (4) More and better academic and personal counseling;
(5) Elimination of problems for minority students in housing arrangements; (6) Effective assistance in finding job placements for minority students and graduates; (7) Assistance in transportation to and from Storrs for persons who could otherwise not get here; (8) Development or expansion of special compensatory programs or other ways of overcoming educational disadvantages resulting from inadequate preparation.

(1) Increased Financial Assistance. Prior to 1968 the numbers of students coming from really impoverished or disadvantaged backgrounds were relatively small. In consequence, the experience of the financial aid people at the University had not prepared them fully for some of the kinds of problems which they began to recognize as the numbers of genuinely poor students grew steadily. Not only was it urgent somehow to lay hands on significant amounts of money to assist these students; policies and practices in the administration of aid had to be examined in the light of their different backgrounds and needs.

For example, previously it had been reasonable to assume in most cases that a student should save a good deal of money from summer employment to help cover the next year's costs. Now it was found that some of the new group of students had to contribute to the support of their families and could not possibly save money from their summer earnings. As a result, modifications were made in the approach to the calculation of need in the cases of students falling in this category.

It was also recognized that if black or otherwise disadvantaged students were to be able to approach their studies without debilitating concern over finances, they would need to have some assurance that support would be available to them on a continuing basis as long as they were adequately successful in their work. Thus, the concept of guaranteed support was introduced for the first time during this period. Under this approach, a student could count on continued support for at least two years and be almost certain of it for two more years, with the understanding that the amount of self help expected from him in the latter half of his four-year program would increase over that required in the first half.*

Also related to the financial and academic difficulties facing students from extremely deprived backgrounds was the move to assure such students a maximum amount of "gift aid," such as scholarships and grants, as opposed to "self-help" type aid, such as loans and work. It was felt that people in such circumstances should not be asked to jeopardize their studies by devoting too much time to working for their support. And in view of their extremely precarious financial backgrounds, not to mention problematical financial futures, most of them should not be asked to assume any more burden of debt than absolutely necessary.

Finally, the student aid office attempted to bolster and facilitate the work of the admissions department in recruiting minority students. It undertook to expedite the processing of financial aid

*The term "guaranteed support" may also be interpreted to mean that a student is awarded a four-year scholarship. For example, he might be told at the time of his acceptance as a freshman that he would receive $6,000 at the rate of $1,500 per year for four years. The University is not in a position to offer this sort of guarantee.
applications for new students, particularly the unusually capable applicants from out-of-state, so as to be sure that the University would not lose out in the competition for promising students.

In considering the quantitative changes which have taken place in financial aid since 1968 it is necessary to speak in generalities, in view of the paucity of data. For one thing, information concerning the distribution of aid among different groups of recipients at the beginning of the period is unavailable. Data for later years are scarce or incomplete, and what information there is requires too much interpretation and qualification to be usable in a summary presentation such as this.

Before attempting a few generalizations it should be noted that the modifications referred to above, though introduced in response to the needs of black students in many cases, are applied to all who qualify in terms of need, regardless of other factors. This means, of course, that black students who do not need aid are not given it, while white students who do require it do receive it.

In fact, many more white students receive aid than Blacks, which is not surprising when one considers that there are roughly 12,000 white students and somewhat less than 700 Blacks. Unfortunately, however, young people coming to the institution from minority, inner-city populations are vastly more likely to be economically disadvantaged than students coming out of the majority population. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that under these circumstances a much higher percentage of the Blacks receive aid than Whites.

In terms of per capita aid, both black and white students appear to receive about the same amounts. Because of their generally greater need, however, the financial aid package of most black students contains a significantly larger amount of gift aid and a correspondingly smaller amount of self-help aid, such as loans and work opportunities. Conversely, the tendency is for needy white students, who are on the average less needy than the Blacks, to receive a larger share of their aid in the form of loans and jobs and a smaller share as gift aid. The result is that black students generally do receive more gift aid per capita than the Whites, while the latter receive more self-help aid per capita than the Blacks.

The foregoing comments do not give much insight into two important questions: Have we lost potential minority students because of our inability to offer them the help they required? Has the financial aid program been adequate to the needs of all minority students who have come to the University?

The answer to the first question is that we have no doubt lost some minority applicants who were able to secure a more attractive aid package at another institution, though there is no way of knowing how many. It seems likely that most of those lost in this manner are the really exceptional students who are attractive to many institutions and eagerly sought by them.

The answer to the second is that the financial aid program has
been able to meet the needs of all needy black students who have enrolled but that it has had to rely rather heavily on self help funds to do so. This may have meant, at least in some cases, that students were obliged to take on more debt or work than they ought to have been asked to assume.

In view of the situation described in these pages, particularly the significant increases in minority enrollments, it is not surprising that much larger total amounts of funds are currently being awarded to needy minority students than formerly. And since the amounts awarded to the rest of the student population have not grown as rapidly or as much in the same period, it follows that minority students as a group are also receiving a larger share of the total available money than they did three or four years earlier.

(2) More Active Recruiting of Minority Students. Mention has already been made of the fact that recruiting of black students had begun with the hiring of a black admissions man in the summer of 1966. When he moved on to another position, he was replaced by another Black who was later joined by a second. And in 1970, a Puerto Rican was added to the admissions staff to give new impetus to the developing effort to encourage students from Spanish speaking families to attend the University. These specialists have devoted much of their efforts to finding minority students and encouraging them to apply. They have visited high schools throughout the state, where they have met with potential applicants in groups and individually, they have sought recommendations of students from all possible sources, have carried on extensive correspondence and discussion with individuals with financial or other problems, and have assisted in many ways the introduction and adjustment of students to the institution. Some figures which were given in an earlier section (see page 10) indicate the results of their efforts to the present time.

The foregoing efforts were exclusively at the undergraduate level. Although the need for recruiting graduate students was recognized early in a number of quarters, it was not until the spring of 1971 that a black assistant dean of the graduate school was formally assigned the job of stimulating, facilitating, and coordinating the recruiting of minority graduate students. At this writing it is too early for his efforts to have borne fruit; in the meantime the imposition of a higher tuition by the legislature, combined with the drying up of various sources of funds for graduate students is almost certain to create fresh and damaging new difficulties.

(3) Liberalization of Admissions Standards for Students with Inadequate Preparation. In the summer of 1968 it was supposed by many that in order to secure increasing numbers of black students it would be necessary to make some adjustments in the standards by which students were admitted. Until that time numbers had been small and the process normally selective, though in the summer of 1967 a group of 19 students, mostly black and Puerto Rican, had been admitted on condition that they attend the Summer Program, which was designed to strengthen their academic skills in preparation for entrance into their freshman year. In subsequent years the numbers entering the freshman year in this manner have increased, reaching 90 in 1971. In addition, other students have been admitted in the last two years under
a supportive program entitled CEMS-Committee for the Education of Minority Students. Members of this group have been offered special tutoring and counseling to assist them in their adjustment to the demands of the new situation in which they find themselves.

Whether to identify this approach to admission of students with poor academic preparation as a "liberalization" of standards is not clear. No formal lowering of required test scores has taken place, but heavier weights have undoubtedly been attached to other factors influencing decisions concerning the admissibility of particular students. While it is quite possible that some students have gained admission to the institution who would not have been accepted in earlier years, the help provided them has been designed to overcome their initial disadvantages. Furthermore, it should be remarked that no formal relaxation of requirements or standards for graduation took place.

From the foregoing it is apparent that it has not been necessary to take in students unqualified for college work in order to increase significantly the numbers of minority students in the institution. This is not to say that every such student has in fact succeeded, but neither could that statement be made about the majority student population. The admissions process is not so refined as to guarantee that every person accepted as a student will be successful, though acceptance is a strong indication that the University believes an applicant to have the necessary ability.

It is true, however, that standards have been applied with greater flexibility in some cases where academic disadvantage is clearly a factor, with special efforts being made to eliminate the disadvantage as quickly and effectively as possible.*

(4) More and Better Academic and Personal Counseling. There appears to be no doubt that most, if not all, black and other minority students feel a strong need for counselors of their own race or ethnic group. Many of them face difficult problems of adjustment upon first entering the strange and sometimes hostile world of the University, for which their mostly segregated living and education have not prepared them. Some have asserted, undoubtedly with justification, that a white counselor cannot understand fully the nature of their prior experience, and thus cannot function effectively as an advisor to them.

In view of the foregoing, the assumption has been made that "more and better" counseling of minority students would result from the employment of larger numbers of black (and, later, Puerto Rican) counselors—more, because there would be more people available, and better, because of their backgrounds and experience.

Pursuant to this reasoning, a number of appointments of minority counselors have been made during the period since 1967-68. In February 1972, the numbers were as follows:

| Admissions Department | Two black and one Puerto Rican assistant directors of Admissions |

*It is worth noting that the approach described here for admitting "disadvantaged" students was only the continuation of practices previously followed in considering applicants with some sort of educational or other handicap.
--two men, one woman.

Student Aid
Two black counselors--one woman, one man.

Counseling and Testing
Two black counselors--one woman, one man.

Summer Program
(Year-round staff)
Two black and one white staff member--one man, two women. (not full-time counselors)

Student Affairs Office
Six black persons (four men, two women) in administrative positions significantly involved in counseling though not full-time. In addition, six black students (one woman, five men) serving part-time as assistants in residence halls.

It must be recognized, of course, that minority members of the faculty or administration may also find themselves involved in a great deal of counseling even beyond what is expected of them as part of their jobs. In effect, they are busy but unidentified members of the counseling staff of the institution, serving with great generosity and dedication, not only to assist students to work out their own problems but also to serve as positive models with which the students can identify in seeking their own direction.

5) Elimination of problems for minority students in housing arrangements. With larger numbers of black students coming into the institution in the late 60's a renewed awareness of two sorts of problems in the area of housing began to take shape. Although it had been years since the University first established a clear anti-discrimination policy with regard to fraternities and sororities, it was still possible for those already residing in a living unit to practice a kind of exclusiveness in the selection of future residents. This was, of course, indefensible, especially in publicly owned facilities, and naturally was seen by many as incompatible with the dignity of the individual of any race of background, but especially offensive to members of the growing black student community. For this reason the procedure for room selections was changed to make it possible for any student to choose any living unit, without requiring invitation or acceptance by those already living there. Priority for assignment to a given dormitory was to be determined by class standing and by random drawing of numbers within class groups, thus making it impossible for prearranged groups of any size to secure rooms in the same building. Two persons wishing to room together were, however, allowed to make their room selection together.

At the same time, however, it was recognized that this approach would undoubtedly spread the relatively small numbers of a minority so thinly over the campus that a feeling of isolation would be unavoidable. It was decided, therefore, that small groups of black students would be permitted to form "clusters" in a given dormitory at the first room drawing following the introduction of the new rules. Thus some
residence halls may have, say, ten or more black students, while others have none. Clusters formed in this manner have tended to persist, since the rules allow students to remain in the same dormitory as long as they wish. As members of a cluster leave, however, new additions are governed by the regular priority based on class standing.

It would be hard to determine the extent to which these official actions on the part of the University have eliminated problems for minority students; undoubtedly many less tangible ones persist. It is probably safe to assert however, that without these actions, problems in these areas would most likely have continued to arise.

(6) **Effective assistance in finding job placements for minority students and graduates.** Until the increased input of black and other minority students begins to produce an increased output of graduates, the need for special efforts in the placement area is not acute. By June of 1971, however, the numbers of such graduates were sufficiently large to indicate that special efforts on their behalf might be desirable. As of this writing, little has been accomplished, though the Placement and Career Planning Office has expressed its intention of adding a black counselor to its staff as soon as its budget permits. Action within the next year will determine how effective this office's help will prove to be for minority graduates.

(7) **Assistance in Transportation to and from Storrs.** Although public transportation may have improved to a slight extent in this period, it seems certain that the motivation for it had nothing to do with providing increased opportunities for minority students to attend the University. It is possible that black students have benefited from whatever improvements have taken place, of course. The University itself, in the meantime, has done nothing directly to provide transportation to or out of Storrs for students who were not in a position to provide their own. This particular need has not, in fact, seemed to be particularly urgent.

(8) **Development or Expansion of Compensatory Programs.** With the exception of CEMS (1969), mentioned a few pages back, the institution has not undertaken much that is new in this field since the initiation of the Summer Program (1967), and CONNPEP (1967). As previously noted, the size of the Summer Program has been expanded, which is the important thing. CONNPEP, on the other hand, has not expanded its size, believing that the present size is best for the kind of results it seeks. Of course, this program, while operated by the University, is working with high school students not yet ready for college. It is not dealing with the University's own students, though some of its graduates do enroll here.

Though not separate and distinct "programs," several additional ways are available to assist students with poor preparation to overcome this handicap. The counseling activities previously referred to could be so viewed. Tutoring, offered especially to those who have entered through the Summer Program and CEMS, should also be considered as such an effort. Budget deficiencies have limited this service, however. Finally, flexibility in student course programs is sometimes used to permit those who need time to adjust to college work to take more than
the usual eight semesters for completion.

Objective 3: "To expand opportunities for employment of members of minority and disadvantaged groups throughout the University."

When this objective was defined a number of areas of action seemed to require attention if it were to be accomplished: (1) Recruiting; (2) Housing; (3) Training; (4) Changing job standards, and (5) Improved transportation. As might be supposed, the problems of locating, attracting, and holding minority employees differ according to the kinds of jobs being considered. While in many fields of academic specialization it was and is difficult to find significant numbers of black persons who have the usual formal credentials, at least one has the whole country to draw from, and problems of local housing or transportation do not loom large as factors in attracting them. On the other hand, to find and attract minority persons for classified positions, the University cannot comb the nation, let alone the state; and when it looks in its more local area, it finds that transportation and housing may well be factors of major importance in encouraging potential employees to join the institution.

(1) Recruiting. In considering how to exert its influence to encourage the recruitment of minority faculty, particularly black, the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities recognized that it must reach the academic departments, where the real work of hiring must be done. It was assured of the firm support of the top administration, which through its actions continued to make it abundantly clear that it considered the expansion of black faculty to be of great importance to the institution.

The approach taken by the Council was to organize discussion groups with the heads of virtually every department on the campus during the spring and fall of 1969. In some cases, members of departments who had special responsibilities in staffing also attended. Each group consisted of eight to ten department heads or departmental representatives and, in most instances, all members of the Executive Committee of the Council. Discussion lasted about two hours and centered mainly about the problems of finding black candidates. Various suggestions were discussed and explored and, in most cases, this led to an illuminating discussion of the great importance of expanding the pool of candidates over the long run by expanding the intake of black students into college and graduate school. No explicit effort was made to convince those in attendance that an increase in black faculty was desirable and necessary; it was assumed that all in attendance were already convinced of that, and the intensity and seriousness of the discussion demonstrated that this was indeed true in the vast majority of cases, if not all.

The diffusion of the recruiting process from that point on makes it difficult to trace with confidence the effects of these introductory conferences. Moreover, a number of other encouraging factors were present in the situation, such as the influence and pressure exerted by the organized black students and the encouragement by the top administration through budgetary and other means. It can be stated with confidence, however, that a number of departments did in fact seek black scholars to invite onto their staffs and that these efforts met with
preparation were to be relaxed, as many argue they should be, for a variety of persuasive reasons, new provisions for post-employment training would have to be made. Such a plan is now (1972) being considered in the Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

When one considers the situation regarding sub-or non-professional jobs, the situation is about the same. With the exception of one small program, no special provisions for training minority persons have been introduced in the past four years. The program referred to, known as the Governmental Assistants Program, and conducted by the state personnel department with funds supplied by the federal government, has brought about a dozen young men into apprentice jobs in University laboratories and shops. Of these, about two thirds have been members of minority groups and one third disadvantaged Whites. Of the group, two were placed on the University payroll in regular jobs in February, 1972; others are expected to move into regular employment when and if the necessary approval is received from state authorities. Budget stringencies at the present time create some concern on this score, however.

(4) Changing job standards. In view of the fact that members of the classified service at the University are hired under state personnel regulations, hiring procedures at the University cannot deviate from those in the state service at large, where there has been no official change of standards to permit the recruitment of larger numbers of minority employees. Nor, as suggested earlier, has any program been developed to make it possible to bring in minority candidates in any significant numbers for jobs outside the classified service, though explorations toward this end are underway in at least one area of the institution.

(5) Improved transportation. Earlier comments on the subject of transportation into and out of Storrs apply equally at this point. The University has, essentially, not found it possible to do anything to encourage the establishment of public transportation which would make it possible for significant numbers of persons to commute to Storrs from urban centers such as Hartford, which is the nearest city with a significant pool of minority workers. Such preliminary investigations as have been made indicate that for the present, at least, economic feasibility would be a serious barrier.

Objective 4: "To assist in the amelioration or solution of social problems outside the University—local communities, State of Connecticut, beyond."

Three principal means were envisaged for contributions of this sort: (1) existing or new extension services organized and operated by the University, (2) individual efforts on the part of faculty and administrative personnel, and (3) efforts by students.

(1) Existing or new extension services. There are four service arms of the University which deal directly or indirectly with the kinds of social problems which the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities had in mind when the above objective was written: the interrelated problems of race, poverty, and the city. These groups are the
Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Continuing Education Services, the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economic Studies in the School of Business Administration, and the Institute of Urban Research, all of which had begun to function before the period with which this account deals. No new services have been established to contribute to the University's newly defined objectives in the field of human rights and opportunities, but the Cooperative Extension Service, which traditionally had been concerned with rural populations, has continued and expanded its reorientation toward the problems of urban people. Thus, though an old service, it has added new scope to the University's capacity to assist with the problems of people in inner city settings.

(2) Individual efforts by faculty and administrative personnel. Because of the difficulty of knowing in detail the personal activities of so large a group of people, it is impossible to say whether the volume of work on the problems of our society is greater now than it was before the trauma of Martin Luther King's death. There have always been persons who have devoted their energies and talents to public service of one sort or another, and there will always be. For a time, in the aftermath of anxiety generated by the events of April, 1968, there was a surge of concern, and many people devoted themselves to projects which fell within their interest. As noted previously, the Community Involvement Program was conceived by the President and Board of Trustees as a method of permitting members of the faculty to engage in community work in the area of human rights and opportunities, but the response to it was limited and diminished rapidly after the first year, 1968-69.

One effort which has come to public notice, and which has involved a number of faculty members, is the campaign against racism which developed during the academic year 1971-72. Undoubtedly, many other individuals have been devoting themselves to some aspect of the problems of race, poverty, and cities as consultants, researchers, or active participants, but no measure of the amount or effectiveness of these efforts is available.

(3) Individual efforts by students. As in the case of faculty and staff, it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of the work of students in this area. There is little doubt that there is a considerable volume of such activity, and it seems likely that it has increased in recent years as more students have become aware of the problems of their society and more anxious to try to do something about them.

In terms of programs which involve students, two are of note. The first of these is the student-organized and operated tutoring program, which was begun in 1961 and now involves several hundred students in tutoring children in Hartford, Willimantic, and the Mansfield Training School. The other program is the Student Involvement Program, which was described earlier (page 13) and in recent years has made it possible for sixty or more black students to spend their summers working with the children of their own home communities. This program, of course, was a direct outcome of the institution's new thrust in human rights and opportunities.
For a limited number of students, such activity has also been encouraged by incorporating work on social problems into formal educational programs. The Urban Semester Program, for example, sends a dozen men and women each semester to live and work in North Hartford, a predominantly black and Spanish speaking area of that city. This was begun in the fall of 1968. In a somewhat similar vein is the program under which the School of Education sends students to live in New Haven or New London for a semester of work and learning about the problems of educating disadvantaged children in ghetto areas. And, finally, students who are members of the Inner College frequently build at least part of their program of study around involvement in community action work; persons pursuing the more traditional course pattern also are encouraged by instructors in certain fields to become similarly involved.

With the exception of the tutoring programs, which probably involve more students than any other single community activity, all of the foregoing types of involvement have been introduced since 1968.

*Objective 5: "To foster study and research on the problems of minority groups and on human rights and opportunities in American Society."*

Methods of achieving this result were outlined as follows: (1) stressing the need for greater knowledge and understanding in this field, (2) encouraging sabbatic leaves for such purposes, (3) offering assistance through the University Research Foundation, and (4) creation of special research agencies or groups within the University or encouragement of existing institutes to place such problems on their agendas.

Topics for their own study and research are, of course, selected by faculty members according to their interests and needs. The first three approaches listed above were designed to encourage those in appropriate fields to turn their attention to studies which would be relevant to urgent social problems. So far as can be determined, no official, planned steps to accomplish this have been taken.

Nor has there been any move to create a special research institute or center which would occupy itself with the kinds of problems being discussed here. This is not to say, of course, that existing groups, such as the Institute of Urban Research or the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economic Studies, have not continued their interest in these matters.

REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Looking back over the foregoing record of attempt, success, and failure, it is possible for one observer to experience a glow of satisfaction at what has been accomplished, while another despairs that so little has been done. This must be regarded as natural and inevitable, since no two persons come to a consideration of the record with the same emotional involvement, the same hopes, or the same expectations. In brief, success, like beauty and contact lenses, may lie in the eye of the beholder.

The danger, however, is that those who experience satisfaction
will be among the white majority which, being the majority, provides most of the decision makers and has the ability to foster or discourage change. Unqualified satisfaction with what has been done may lead to a damaging reduction of interest and action long before the actual changes in the situation justify it. It is for this reason that this account now undertakes a deliberate search for shortfalls and failures. For few would question that, no matter how much we may have done or how far we may have come, there still is more to be done, a greater distance to travel.

The mood in which the search for failure is undertaken is diagnostic rather than condemnatory. At this point there seems little to gain by fixing blame, aside from some sort of pointless emotional satisfaction, though there may be much to learn from an identification of those points at which further effort is required. Moreover, just as credit for accomplishment must usually be shared among members of several different groups which participate in the support and management of the University, so blame, if it were to be placed fairly and realistically, would have to be spread. It is often too easy, seriously misleading, and thus a handicap to correct and helpful diagnosis of the situation, to blame a failure solely on the legislature, the governor, the president, the administration, the radicals, the reactionaries, the faculty, or the students. Ironically, when introducing change into a complex, democratic, and interdependent organization failure, as well as success, is a joint venture! We may safely assume, therefore, at least in many cases, that where we have fallen short, many people are implicated, though some more deeply than others. And if we are to move forward again with greater effectiveness, all of us are needed.

Purposes, Goals, Objectives

At the deepest level, the most serious shortcoming has been the failure to reach a widespread consensus on and commitment to the institution's purposes, goals, and objectives as they relate to developing concepts of human rights and opportunities. The earlier sections of this report make it clear that a new articulation of the University's objectives has been available since the summer of 1968 and that the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities has been guided in its own work and in its advice to others by these objectives. The unfortunate fact is, however, that these objectives have not penetrated much beyond their narrow point or origin. They have had little practical effect on day-to-day decision making or long range planning by operating personnel throughout the institution. At the present time, not yet four years after their publication, it would be difficult to find members of the faculty or administration who could recall more than the fact that some statements had been issued by the Council on the subject of long range objectives. To find an administrator who had made conscious and explicit use of those objectives should probably be regarded as a minor miracle. One scarcely finds them posted on every office wall. Even their reception by the Board of Trustees when they first received them from the Council now appears to have been incredibly perfunctory, which may help to account for their not having achieved a more central place in the thinking of all members of the enterprise.
When writing this report I became conscious of the fact that I never had known exactly what the reception of our report by the Trustees had been. I knew that they had not "adopted" the objectives, but I could not visualize exactly what they had done. Upon examining the minutes of their meeting of September 18, 1968, I found that, "President Babidge distributed copies of a report on the long-range objectives and plans of the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities. Consensus was expressed that the Council was to be commended for their initial efforts."

Since a great deal of other business was transacted at that meeting, I am afraid I see the members of the Board turning over a few pages of the report, saying that it looked interesting, and moving on. If there was any suspicion that the University was at an historic turning point, the taker of the minutes missed it!

In spite of the foregoing, there has been much action on the human rights front during the past few years, and it has been in the spirit of the objectives. There is no intention of suggesting that they have been rejected by the community; they simply do not occupy a consistently or consciously important place among the things which people consider when making decisions about disparate aspects of the University's operation or development. As evidence of this, they are seldom, if ever, cited as the explanation or justification of a decision or plan, except by those associated with the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, which proposed them in the first place.

It might be objected that if the spirit of the objectives is being followed there is no need to worry about their failure to have achieved widespread formal acceptance. To an extent this is true, but there are two things to be said in reply: (1) The obscure position of human rights objectives in the decision making framework of the institution leaves them to be considered only by those who are interested and concerned about such matters; there is certain to be an uneven distribution of such consciousness among decision makers, with the result that human rights objectives will be ignored in some areas of operation; (2) allowing the statement of objectives on human rights to find its own place in the thinking of persons concerned with what happens at the University (and this includes nearly everyone associated with it) leaves open the question of the importance of such objectives in relation to other objectives which are considered in operating and developing the institution. When there is a conflict between human rights objectives and fiscal, athletic, or academic objectives, for example, which should take precedence? This question will be answered differently by different persons or groups engaged in the making of decisions, with the inevitable result that in at least some cases human rights objectives will be subordinated to others. In some instances this might somehow be justified, but what about those cases where it is not? Should there not be some consideration given to an
institution-wide understanding on the importance of human rights objectives in relation to others, in order that human rights would prevail in those cases where they should? Would it not be beneficial, in other words, for the administration of the institution to initiate some process leading to the development of a consensus on the definition of human rights objectives and their place in the hierarchy of all University objectives?

Two groups which have been least involved in the process of defining and implementing new objectives for the University in the area of human rights are the faculty and the state government, including both the legislative and executive branches. Within the institution, occasional and hesitant efforts have been made by the administration and by the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities to involve the faculty, but without notable success. The fault has not always been the faculty's, it might be added, since many of the actions described in the foregoing section of this history could be taken (and therefore were taken) without consulting the faculty. At the time this approach seemed advisable and probably was, in order to save the time and trouble which would have been required to get programs or proposals considered, perfected, and accepted by the various faculties or the University Senate. In retrospect, however, it may be seen as one element in the failure to build consciousness of the problems and consensus on human rights objectives and priorities within the institution.

In similar manner and for similar reasons the state government has not been sufficiently involved in considering and defining the institution's role and objectives in the education of disadvantaged and minority students. It should not have been unreasonable to expect that some initiative from outside the University would prompt the requisite decisions from the state government, particularly since the task is one which should not belong to the University alone. Failing such action from the state level, however, the University and each of the other institutions in the state system was forced to develop its own plans without the involvement of those in a position to supply the funds. What seems to have happened, at least at the University, is that the administration, some of the faculty, and special groups like the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities have projected a larger vision and a greater ambition for the institution than the governor and the legislature (and the people of the state) have yet accepted. Thus the legislature, even when ready to finance what it understands to be the established mission of the University, may not be ready to finance a larger mission about which it is only partly informed and may even have some doubts. If in some manner it had been induced to participate in setting the role and defining the objectives, it would have been more likely to accept the responsibility of supporting the action necessary for the achievement of the objectives in human rights and opportunities.

There is a risk, of course, that the mission finally established for the institution by higher authorities might fall short of that desired by people at the University. In the short run it might appear advisable to avoid this risk by proceeding without participation by the legislature. Given the fact, however, that the only reliable source of substantial funds over a prolonged period is the state,
the minimal involvement of the state government up to this time may prove to be a barrier to significant fund raising for human rights purposes for some time to come.

The implication of what has been said is that the dedication and convictions of members of the organization, and their motivation to change it, play an important part in the shaping and articulation of the organization's objectives, while the clear and convincing statement and dissemination of objectives throughout an organization play an important part in stimulating support of the objectives and motivation to work for their achievement. The two factors tend to provide mutual reinforcement. In this complex situation, in which a number of variables are operating, it is difficult to say where the mistakes of commission or omission have occurred, but there seems little doubt that a higher level of support for the organization's objectives and a greater degree of commitment to their accomplishment by all constituencies are required if they are to be met more fully.

The natural result of these failures has been that some sectors of the human rights and opportunities effort at the University have been operated at half-throttle. The absence of clear cut, supportive policy and attendant financial support from the legislature has required the administration of the University to improvise and to temporize, and to move more slowly than it would have been willing to move. Financial limitations have, furthermore, confronted the administration with the unpleasant necessity of making hard choices when distributing scarce resources among traditional academic uses and newer, less conventional human rights programs. This has been made difficult by the absence of clearly agreed-upon priorities within the institution and uncertainty about the extent of faculty support for new departures of these kinds; the administration has, as a result, consistently favored raising new money for the new programs in order to avoid direct conflict between established and innovative types of uses. Unfortunately, new money in significant amounts has not been forthcoming from the legislature, and the limited amounts available from other sources, while keeping human rights-related programs alive, have too often left them undernourished.

Inadequate Development of the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities.

Deriving from these underlying weaknesses in the University's approach to the job of expanding human rights and opportunities are fundamental flaws in the foundation for future progress. Foremost among these is the incomplete development of the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities. There are a number of tasks essential to the continued development and maintenance of an effective human rights effort in the institution which could be performed by the Council if it were adequately staffed.

For example, to serve most productively it should be well equipped to encourage and assist the administration and the various operating arms of the University to formulate goals, to evaluate progress toward those goals, and to design programs to raise the level of performance and progress where it is seen to be inadequate. This needs to be done for the institution as a whole, as well as its component
parts. The Council should be equipped not only to assist in these ways, relative to existing programs and efforts, but also to serve as a generator of new ideas, a source and stimulus of innovation. It should have the time and interest to permit it to discern new or impending developments of which the institution should be aware and for which it should be preparing itself. As an example, since positive action to serve increasing numbers of black students was first begun, the University has come to realize that it must take steps to change its attitudes and practices concerning Puerto Rican students and women. While the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities should have been able to lead the University to an earlier sensitivity to these impending needs, it has concerned itself only marginally and intermittently with the women's liberation movement and has made only modest beginnings in an effort to become involved with the problems of the Puerto Rican students. In good part its inattention to these new subjects was probably due to the fact that its limited personnel were still faced with more than enough to do in the continuing effort to improve and expand the response to the problems of the University's black community.

During the period from its formation until August 1970 (over two years) the Council had the full-time services of one professional, Lawrence L. Parrish, the chairman of the Council who was, in effect, the professional staff and operating director as well. During this period even the most intense activity on the part of the Chairman, working in close and continuous partnership with the Executive Committee, which was deeply involved, was insufficient to keep up with the demands of the unfolding job of the Council. It was necessary to concentrate on the most urgent needs, and many problems of less urgency went unnoticed or unheeded.

In the summer of 1970, the University secured the services of a second full-time professional, David L. Holmes, who was designated executive director of the Council. Although it was possible to provide some additional professional help to the new executive director, after a time the chairman became less involved in the day-to-day operations of the organization, thus reducing the manpower available and leaving the Council still in need of extra professional staff if it were to be able to respond effectively to the needs of the institution. And to make matters worse, the deteriorating financial situation made it seem advisable for Holmes to devote a large share of his time to efforts to raise money for human rights and opportunities. Relieved of this nagging burden, his attention could have been centered more fully on other concerns.

In summary, the Council has been prevented, partly by the press of immediate as opposed to long-run concerns, partly by inadequate financing and consequent lack of sufficient personnel and time, and sometimes by the difficulty of knowing how, from making the contribution it should make to laying an adequate groundwork for future progress by the institution. It has not established a procedure or the machinery to carry on, or to stimulate others to carry on, a continuing examination of the University's objectives in human rights and opportunities, for the purpose of clarifying, expanding, or changing them. Likewise, it has not established a process for evaluating the
success of efforts designed to achieve the objectives. For this job to be done well, attention must be given to the problem of expressing objectives in terms of measurable results and to the development of ways in which to measure what actually is accomplished. Only from more adequate knowledge of where, how, why, and by how much we have fallen short of the objectives we have set ourselves will we be able to move ahead intelligently and effectively.

Moreover, the Council has not been able to develop its capacity for sensing emerging problems or concerns before they become obvious; it has, therefore, limited capacity to assist the institution to plan for the future. Similarly, it does not have adequate capability to stimulate innovation in the institution through the design of proposals for consideration and possible implementation by appropriate bodies or individuals in the University. Nor can it offer more than limited help to those who come to it for assistance in developing their own plans.

Problems for the Future.

Even if all the shortcomings so far described were corrected and a proper base for effective action established, there would still be questions to answer and decisions to make before satisfactory progress could be made on some of the basic problems of human rights and opportunities which still face the institution. A few of the areas in which more thinking is required or in which more knowledge is essential to progress are suggested in the following sections. It will be noted that the questions raised are of two types: those dealing with what we should be trying to accomplish and those asking how we can do the things we want to—in other words, about methods.

1. Though we have made progress in the elimination of institutional expressions of racism, more progress is required, and in terms of individual attitudes and actions there is still much to be accomplished. How can "racist" beliefs and attitudes be changed or eradicated? What can the institution itself do in this field? Should it do anything to change attitudes of its members? Is it necessary (in fact, is it possible?) to change attitudes, or is it perhaps enough to change overt behavior of a "racist" character? What is the relationship of attitudes to behavior? What chance is there that sanctions imposed by the institution could and would bring about a change in the attitudes or behavior of students, faculty members, or other members of the University staff? What sorts of sanctions would be possible? Would there be conflict between efforts to change behavior of a racist character and the traditional value of freedom of thought and expression? Could potential conflicts be reconciled? Would it be more effective to arouse people for some positive goal than to arouse them against racism? In fact, what is racism? How should racial incidents be dealt with? Does the Ombudsman have sufficiently well defined goals, functions, and powers?

2. Though considerable institutional change has taken place, the question of how to bring changes in a large, complex, interdependent organization is one about which our knowledge is still primitive. What, for example, are the roles of leadership and "followership" in a given situation? What is the impact of each on the other? How far out
ahead of his constituency can a leader get and still be followed? In what ways does the membership influence the leadership? What is the role of threat or pressure? What are the relative merits of private diplomacy vs. public confrontation as methods of securing change? How are people motivated for change? Could the reward system of the University be developed or modified to encourage members of the institution to change? As an institution created and sustained by the state, how far can the University go in changing itself? How much must it reflect the attitudes and traditions of the people of the state or its political leaders? What are their attitudes? How can it foster change in the state which will facilitate change within the institution?

In this area a deeper set of questions concerns the advisability of seeking change through modification of the existing institutional structure within an unchanged social structure. There are those who believe that very fundamental social and economic changes are necessary before meaningful change can be achieved in the position of disadvantaged people in the society. Specifically, is it likely that the University can achieve its professed goals in human rights and opportunities so long as the basic assumptions and fundamental power relationships in the larger society go unchanged? If not, what should the University as an agency of the state do? Should it give up its efforts to change, in the belief that they are all futile, or should it do the best it can while awaiting changes in the social, political and economic framework within which it operates? Should the University, as an institution, attempt to lead the state to make fundamental social and economic change? What changes would it advocate? Who should determine or define the changes which it would advocate?

3. A somewhat more pragmatic question which has great significance for the future development of human rights activities concerns the future role of the Storrs campus in relation to the overall University system and, indeed, the state's whole system of higher education. If, as some people expect, the main campus is destined to evolve into an upper division and graduate facility, while freshmen and sophomores attend one of the branches (or another unit of the state system of higher education), what will this mean to the institution's planning for special efforts on behalf of minority education?

Thus far we have operated on the premise that minority students with educational, economic, or other disadvantages should be enrolled at Storrs, since it was there that it was most feasible to develop the supportive framework which some needed, especially in their first year or two. This policy of concentrating disadvantaged students at the main campus appears to be incompatible with the possible elimination of freshmen and sophomores from that campus; the contradiction needs to be faced if indeed the latter development is to be encouraged.

4. Finally, the role of the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities requires continued thought and clarification. As an advocate of action favorable to minority elements in the population of the institution it is sometimes called upon for support by those who believe themselves unfairly treated, but its role in such situations is not always clear. It clearly has the power to recommend policy changes to those who make policy, but the degree to which it should function in cases of individual complaint is not so clear. What should be its
relationship to the Ombudsman, for example? And how should its work be related to that of an office concerned with the rights of women? And what should be the relationship of these types of organizations to the operating officers of the University—members of the top administration, deans, and departments? It seems obvious that a Council on Human Rights and Opportunities cannot run the University, but are there ways in which its influence can legitimately be strengthened? How can it involve the faculty to a greater extent in the common task? How can it build greater support on the part of the student body, the staff, the administration?

These questions, and others like them, can be answered only by hard thinking and debate and, in some cases, experimentation. Most of them do not need to wait for expanded staff or more generous funding. The institution cannot hire outsiders to perform such a task; it must and should be done by the people now available. It should be done soon enough to prepare the University to act when needed funds and staff become available.
APPENDIX A

To: The Board of Trustees, University of Connecticut

From: The Connecticut Union for the Revitalization of Education

A group of concerned persons, including members of the University community, have met and established a committee to investigate meaningful possibilities leading toward the elimination of racist attitudes which threaten to destroy this Republic. We accept the conclusions of the Kerner Report (The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders) that racism is at the heart of the American experience: "...white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it." We observe that the educational process contributes to the continuation of racial attitudes which today divide America into hostile camps.

Therefore, we believe it imperative to adopt strategies for the revitalization of the educational system in order to begin the process of eradication of racist attitudes. Now is the time for action that will produce quick and visible progress. We believe that you, as the policy makers of the University of Connecticut, as leaders in the community and as men of good will, are desirous of creative action. Therefore, in light of the recent assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, accompanied by further ghetto strife, troops in the streets, armed suburbs, bloodshed, misery and potential civil war, we appeal to you, knowing the prestige of your office and its power, to bring about change. How will the University of Connecticut respond?

In our judgment, the following actions are in order to help excise the plague of racism which infects our whole society:

1. We urge the Trustees to examine existing programs affecting the Negro and other disadvantaged Connecticut citizens. The School of Education, for example, has five or six projects which have a direct bearing upon the disadvantaged. How effective are these programs? Have the total resources of the University been utilized? What plans have been made for the future?

2. We would suggest that the University encourage its schools and departments to hold more human relations clinics in the area of race relations for faculty, students and the community-at-large.

3. We would like to see the University take a bold step by establishing workshops, organizing forums and providing speakers for local boards of education, finance committees and PTA associations in the areas of public school policies. These would include, but not be limited to, a careful analysis and redefinition of the meaning of equal educational opportunity, a re-examination of the tax structure with an eye toward redistributing the excess cost of educating the ghetto child among all citizens, and a review of curriculum and instructional patterns in the context of race relations.

4. We would suggest the immediate establishment of summer
institutes for primary and secondary school administrators, teachers and guidance counselors concerning the role of the Negro in American life and the ways of effecting changed racial attitudes and prejudices.

5. We encourage the University to apply what pressure it can upon the State Board of Education to take dramatic steps in guiding minority youth toward college preparatory courses.

6. We believe that the University should apply what pressure it can upon textbook publishers to adequately present minority groups in a more honest perspective in their publications.

7. We believe in the importance of the study of Negro history in the University. We view the existent curriculum as inadequate and suggest that the University recruit a person or persons, who hold nationwide prestige, as well as expertise, in this field in order to widen the impact of the present program. We hope that the University will encourage all students to participate, particularly those contemplating careers in education. Imaginative use of mass media could expand the audience reached by such a course. In addition to a course in Negro history, this person or persons could conduct seminars for faculty members to increase their understanding of the Negro's role in our world.

8. We ask the Trustees to consider the possibility of sponsoring adult education programs in communities throughout the state in order to help eradicate racism in these communities. One such possibility would be the establishment of human relations clinics within local communities and the strengthening of those which already exist. The intelligent use of mass media should also be explored for this purpose.

9. We are encouraged by the University's present efforts to attract Negro students and other disadvantaged youth to the University of Connecticut. But we believe that the Negro population of about 1% within the University does not reflect the role which the state college should play in effecting social change. We therefore ask the Trustees to sharply increase their efforts to correct this imbalance.

10. We urge that the University pursue more vigorously its present efforts in recruiting Black faculty.

11. We believe that the Board of Trustees should be reconstituted to reflect the heterogeneous composition of Connecticut's population, so that all groups in this state can be adequately represented in this important body.

We are fully aware that the above recommendations are neither exhaustive nor final and that you, as concerned citizens, know many of the steps that must be taken to attack the causes of racism in our society. Perhaps a committee involving the leadership of all ethnic groups in the state with a representative group of the Trustees, Faculty and Administration can actively attack this massive social problem which is too large for any one group to deal with effectively. We therefore submit this petition to you with the confidence that you will take appropriate action now.

Not dated; presented to Board of Trustees April 17, 1968 (LLP)
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Proposal: That the University of Connecticut establish the 'University of Connecticut Institute of Race Relations.'

The purpose of this Institute is to introduce programs and adopt strategies for the revitalization of the educational system in order to begin the process of eradicating racist attitudes. The Institute will involve the entire community in support of existing programs and the creation of new programs aimed directly at the elimination of racism.

This Institute would be staffed with a full-time director, a full-time secretary, and two graduate research assistants. There will be a Board of Directors to choose a director and to make policy for the Institute. This Board will be appointed by mutual agreement of the president of the University and C.U.R.E.

The director would develop faculty-exchange agreements with Negro colleges with the concurrence of appropriate department heads and the provost. In this way the number of Black faculty members on this campus might be immediately increased.

The director would have the power to offer graduate and post-doctoral scholarships to Black students, with the concurrence of appropriate department heads and the provost with the ultimate aim of increasing the number of Black faculty in the State of Connecticut.

The director would be given enough money to organize a summer youth conference and various conferences which might serve as a mechanism for encouraging Black-White interaction.

The director would take charge of the University's proposed Urban Semester Program and would be responsible for implementing this program. This program would be under the administrative direction of the provost. The purpose of this program is to expose students to various facets of urban life.

The director would have the power to enter into contracts with consultants to help him establish his programs.

The director would have the power to employ teachers to conduct adult education courses in Black History and Black Literature throughout the State.

The director would have the power to employ, with the concurrence of the appropriate department heads and the provost, teachers of Black History and Black Literature at the University of Connecticut.

The director will publish and edit a journal under the Imprint, University of Connecticut Institute of Race Relations.

Proposed by C.U.R.E.
Not dated; presented to
H. D. Babbidge April 17,
1968. (LLP)
APPENDIX C

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. BUDDS, CHAIRMAN OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
APRIL 17, 1968

The Board of Trustees of The University of Connecticut is pleased to meet with the representatives of the Connecticut Union for the Revitalization of Education. We commend this group for their interest in the development of education to meet the needs of all citizens. We admire their motivation, spirit, and dedication. We welcome their help in assisting us to identify prospective young people who need guidance and support. We will appreciate their counsel in planning new processes and programs which will bring about greater educational advantages.

Board members and administration officers have continually sought ways and means to aid those who have been disadvantaged. When I came on the University Board eleven years ago, I was greatly impressed by President Jorgensen's interest in recruiting and developing Negro students. Since coming to the University in 1962, President Babbridge has consistently striven by both formal and informal means to extend a welcome and helpful hand to students from all walks of life. The University is justly proud of its record and accomplishments in the field of racial equality. The President reported today informally on the programs the University has undertaken to aid this cause.

Today we welcome to this board a distinguished Negro educator, Mr. William D. Waller. We are happy and proud to have him as our associate. We were greatly pleased with the recent promotion of Mr. William Trueheart. Mr. Trueheart, who has been assistant director of Admissions, will serve as special assistant to the president where he will be intimately involved in top level administrative matters.

We fully recognize there is much to be done and that prompt action is necessary. We pledge our cooperation and assistance. We will be pleased to work with the Connecticut Union for the Revitalization of Education and other responsible groups in providing broader educational opportunities. The state university, in keeping with its responsibility for public service, expects to develop initiative and leadership in this cause.

In an effort to be fully responsive to the current and pressing needs of the State of Connecticut, of which your petition is representative, the Board of Trustees has devoted a large part of its deliberations today, to steps that can appropriately be taken to evidence our concerns. I am happy to be able to announce the following:

1. The Trustees authorized the appointment by the president of a Council on the University's Concern for Human Rights and Opportunities. This Council to be broadly representative of student and faculty and community groups, will include in its membership representatives of the Steering Committee of the Connecticut Union for the Revitalization of Education. The Council will be charged with the following responsibilities:
a) To survey current University efforts directed toward improved human rights and opportunities, and to present to the president an evaluation of their general effectiveness;

b) To propose to the president new and additional programs that might properly be included in university budget proposals for the 1969-71 biennium;

c) To cause to be initiated, with the approval of the president, such immediate efforts and programs as can be supported with a combination of limited funds and voluntary effort;

d) To offer such advice as it can to appropriate faculty, student and administrative groups, with the object in view of heightening awareness of the urgency of problems in the area of human rights and opportunities;

e) To formulate a general policy for consideration by the Board of Trustees, describing an appropriate role of active involvement for the University in the area of human rights and opportunities, and reconciling this role with established patterns of university contributions to human advancement.

To initiate the work of this Council, and particularly its short-term programs, the Trustees have appropriated from the Continuing Education Reserve Fund, the sum of $25,000. Office space and clerical assistance will be provided for the Council.

2. The Board of Trustees, persuaded of the importance of direct faculty involvement, has authorized the initiation of a program of special leaves of absence for members of the faculty. Under this Community Involvement Program, up to 25 members of the faculty will be free each semester to devote their full time and energies to direct involvement in activities designed to improve community programs and attitudes relating to human rights and opportunities. The Council on the University's Concern will assist the president in delineating the guidelines to be followed in the administration of this program. The only requirement established by the Board is that leaves of absence may be granted only with the approval of appropriate department heads and deans.

I trust that this brief report of our meeting today will serve as evidence of our shared concern. We join with you in the belief that this University can and will provide vigorous leadership in the movement to advance the cause of true human equality.
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UNIVERSITY COUNCIL on HUMAN RIGHTS and OPPORTUNITIES

LONG RANGE OBJECTIVES AND PLANS

Foreword

On April 17, 1968, the Board of Trustees of the University of Connecticut announced the formation of the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, charging it with the following responsibilities:

"a. To survey current University efforts directed toward improved human rights and opportunities, and to present to the president an evaluation of their general effectiveness;

"b. To propose to the president new and additional programs that might properly be included in University budget proposals for the 1969-71 biennium;

"c. To cause to be initiated, with the approval of the president, such immediate efforts and programs as can be supported with a combination of limited funds and voluntary effort;

"d. To offer such advice as it can to appropriate faculty, student and administrative groups, with the object in view of heightening awareness of the urgency of problems in the area of human rights and opportunities;

"e. To formulate a general policy for consideration by the Board of Trustees, describing an appropriate role of active involvement for the University in the area of human rights and opportunities, and reconciling this role with established patterns of university contributions to human advancement."

In response to pressures of time growing out of the approach of the end of the academic year and the deadline for the submission of proposals for the 1969-71 budget, the Executive Committee of the Council, and the Council itself, moved rapidly to make some progress in areas "b" and "c" of the Trustees' charge.

Even as it did so, the Council was acutely aware of the weakness of its approach; it was making decisions on immediate problems without benefit of a long-range scheme of objectives, priorities, and plans.

This statement was adopted by the University Council on Human Rights and Opportunities July 16, 1968. It was presented to the Board of Trustees on September 18, 1968.
This statement is designed to serve as the basis for the long-range operations of the Council. It attempts to suggest (1) a rationale for the determination of objectives and priorities (2) a specific formulation of objectives and (3) some of the principal means through which progress toward objectives may be sought.

Introduction

Many millions of Americans, because of their race or ethnic origin, do not enjoy equal opportunities to obtain jobs and schooling, to share in the material and cultural progress of the society, to participate fully in the conduct and management of our institutions, and to win the acceptance and respect of their fellows. Slowly and belatedly we are coming to a national resolve that this must not continue. It is imperative that, in every institutional sector, we work to realize the dream of a society in which men's prospects and opportunities are not limited by the circumstances of their birth.

In this climate of concern, universities are reexamining their roles in the stimulation of social change. Some argue that they should assume a direct and aggressive role. Others question the correctness of this view, asserting that the university makes its most effective contribution to social change by avoiding active leadership and providing the environment for the free presentation and objective evaluation of ideas and proposals.

The question of a university's role in the promotion of social change is an important one and requires thorough exploration. There is, however, a serious question whether action can be delayed until a full debate is undertaken and a consensus achieved. The situation now facing the country suggests that the traditional modes of operation of many social institutions, including universities, have not been effective enough to forestall the development of the crisis and that further ways must be found for them to contribute, and quickly, to the attainment of a better society.

Potentialities of the University

The University is an incomparable reservoir of the most diversified talents and resources for the acquisition, exchange and pooling of knowledge and for bringing that knowledge to bear upon the practical problems and social issues of the larger society. The university, and especially the American university, has a long tradition of disseminating its knowledge and of extending its services to the larger community. Further, it has a large measure of autonomy and competence to shape its own policies, to govern itself, and to determine the conditions under which people live and work within its own boundaries. Therefore, it is in a unique position to experiment with designs for living and forms of governance and to create a society of equal opportunity, privilege, and reward which will serve as a model to its graduates and stimulate them to enter the larger community prepared and determined to build there an equally open society.
Responsibility of the University

It is, therefore, the responsibility of the University of Connecticut to seek urgently for ways in which it can contribute to the amelioration or solution of the pressing social problems, and to undertake actively the implementation of policies and programs for which its resources are appropriate. It seems clear that no university, including this one, can be satisfied with what it has thus far accomplished.

It is also the responsibility of the University of Connecticut to create internally a free and open society. It may, in the process, need to offer compensatory advantages to persons who come from disadvantaged backgrounds in order to enable them to participate fully in such a society.

At the same time, the function of a university as a community of individuals jointly pursuing the discovery, creation, and transmission of knowledge and the arts must be preserved. It is the responsibility of the University of Connecticut to provide an open and unrestricted forum in which all aspects of our society may be freely studied, analyzed, criticized, and debated, however sensitive, sacred, or controversial the subjects of inquiry may be.

Limitations of the University

On the other hand, because its resources, human and material, are limited, and because it is primarily organized for the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge, there are some things that the University of Connecticut can do well and economically and others for which other institutions are better fitted. Therefore, in relation to the present crisis, the University should not scatter its efforts diffusely but should try to determine the ways in which it may most effectively make its contributions to the realization of the common enterprise.

Objectives of the University in the Areas of Human Rights and Opportunities

1. To develop within the University a climate of respect, tolerance, and acceptance in which all individuals and groups interact without regard to racial, ethnic, or social differences.

2. To expand educational, social, economic, and cultural opportunities in the University for minority and disadvantaged students.

3. To expand opportunities for employment of members of minority and disadvantaged groups throughout the University.

4. To assist in the amelioration or solution of social problems outside the University—local communities, State of Connecticut, beyond.
5. To foster study and research on the problems of minority groups and on human rights and opportunities in American Society.

Means for Reaching Objectives

We suggest herewith some possible means (which in turn may be regarded as objectives requiring the planning of more specific means) by which the University may seek to achieve the objectives mentioned above.

TO DEVELOP CLIMATE OF RESPECT, etc.

By means of:

1. Increase in minority students
2. Courses and curricula
3. Student Involvement Program
4. Community Involvement Program
5. Cultural activities
6. Social life
7. Training of employees
8. Orientation of students, employees, faculty
9. Student, faculty, and administration leadership
10. Expanded employment of minority persons
11. Lecture series, conferences, seminars

TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY STUDENTS

By means of:

1. Financial assistance
2. Recruiting
3. Revised admissions
4. Counseling
5. Eliminating housing problems
6. Job placement
7. Improved transportation
8. Summer programs and transitional year

TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT

By means of:

1. Recruiting
2. Housing
3. Training
4. Changing job standards
5. Improved transportation
TO ASSIST IN SOCIAL PROBLEMS OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY

By means of:

1. Existing or new extension services organized and operated by University. Some may need to be reoriented as Cooperative Extension has reoriented itself.

2. Individual faculty and administrative personnel
   a. Serving as expert researchers, consultants or advisers
      1. Part time on free or compensated basis
      2. Full time on leave without pay
      3. Full or part time on CIP leaves
   b. As "non-expert" workers under CIP

3. Individual students
   a. As volunteers (Tutorial programs, Mansfield Training School, etc.)
   b. Under SIP of the Council

TO FOSTER STUDY AND RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

By means of:

1. Stressing the urgency of need for greater knowledge and understanding in this field.

2. Encouraging sabbatic leaves for such purposes.

3. Offering assistance through the University Research Foundation.

4. Creation of special research agencies or groups within the University or encouragement of existing institutes to place such problems on their agenda.

The Question of Priorities

At this point it is impossible to anticipate all of the situations in which a choice may have to be made between alternative uses of the University's resources. It seems possible, however, to foresee at least two major types of choice.

1. "Inside" vs. "outside" concerns - i.e., efforts to promote full realization of human rights and opportunities within the University vs. efforts to contribute to the achievement of the same goals in the outside community.
2. The formal educational program vs. "service" activities operated by the University.

These choices involve basic competition for resources. The most that can be said concerning the "inside - outside" choice is that neither can be ignored. They are in this sense of equal importance: neither the University nor the outside community can reach full stature independently of the other; they must be developed concurrently.

The University should strive, therefore, to exert efforts in both areas simultaneously, keeping in mind that success in outside projects may be attainable only when its own internal situation is in order.

The second choice, that between formal education and service activities, may have to be made in specific cases on the basis of the predicted contribution of each approach to the achievement of the University's objectives in the area of human rights and opportunities. That is, the approach which has the highest probability of succeeding would seem the one to choose.

In both choice situations, additional guidelines such as the following may prove useful.

1. We should try to do those things to which the skills, resources and organization of the University best lend themselves -- that is, those for which the talents and tools are already at hand.

2. We should try to do those things that other agencies and structures are not likely to do or not fitted to do, and to avoid those things that may appropriately be left to others.

3. We should, from among the many worthwhile things we might attempt, choose those whose impact, relative to the resources expended, is largest.

4. We should try to do those things that promote the educational enterprise--that is, that provide opportunities for students as well as faculty to enlarge their knowledge and experience of the society we live in.

When the implementation or operation of a program is being considered, two further choice situations may be faced:

1. Implementation of a program by the University itself vs. assignment of implementation to an existing or newly created outside agency.

2. Implementation of a program within the University by the Council vs. an existing University agency vs. the creation of a new University agency.

The following guides to decision in such cases should be used:
1. Preference should be given to existing University agencies
2. Next preference should be given to existing community agencies.

3. Next would come new University agencies.

4. Finally, encouraging the establishment of new community agencies could be considered.

The foregoing guides are not intended for rigid application. For example, it would not be sensible to assign implementation of a program to a University agency if an existing community agency were much more qualified to handle it. Moreover, highly innovative programs might demand the creation of a new agency even though an apparently appropriate agency already existed.

The Role of the Council

The foregoing discussion deals with objectives of the University and its operating agencies or subdivisions. A beginning has been made in identifying the areas in which action by the University may be required to approach the achievement of these objectives. Identification of more immediate objectives and detailed plans for action is still required. It is proposed that this task be undertaken by committees of the Council.

The general objective of the Council is to assist the University to achieve its goals in the field of human rights and opportunities. At this stage of its development it can do this best by serving as an idea-generating agency within the University's structure, whose aim is to promote appropriate action by the operating arms of the University. The Council does not contemplate an operating role for itself where other departments are equipped to carry out particular activities. On the other hand, it intends to involve itself in the operation of programs which cannot be conducted by other divisions of the University.