

**Massachusetts Board of Higher Education  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

---

February 27, 2018  
10:00 a.m.

One Ashburton Place, 21st Floor  
Conference Room 3  
Boston, Massachusetts

**Meeting Minutes**

Committee Members Present: Committee Chair Nancy Hoffman; Board Vice Chair Sheila Harrity; Board Chair Chris Gabrieli; Fernando Reimers; Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau; Student Board Member Danielle Dupuis

Committee Members Absent: Commissioner Carlos Santiago, non-voting member Henry Thomas

Department Staff Present: Keith Connors, Kate Flanagan, Winifred Hagan, Patricia Marshall, Elena Quiroz-Livanis, Angela Williams, Ashley Wisneski

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

AAC Chair Nancy Hoffman called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. She then invited the AAC members and DHE staff members at the table to introduce themselves.

**II. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

On a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the January 16, 2018 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee were approved. Secretary of Education designee Tom Moreau abstained as he was not present at the January 16 meeting.

**III. REMARKS**

Chair Hoffman invited remarks from DHE Commissioner Carlos Santiago, Deputy Commissioner Patricia Marshall and Board Chair Chris Gabrieli, but all declined.

**IV. DISCUSSION**

**A. Revised Program Approval Process for Public Institutions**

List of documents used:

*AAC Meeting PowerPoint, February 27, 2018*

*February 26, 2018 Letter to BHE from Henry Thomas (with attachments: April 26, 2017 letter to Commissioner Santiago from UMass President Martin Meehan and January 23, 2018 memorandum to the BHE from Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Katherine Newman and the UMass Provosts to the BHE)*

Chair Hoffman began the meeting by first acknowledging receipt of a letter by absent committee member, Henry Thomas, on this topic. The letter was accepted into the record. University of Massachusetts President Marty Meehan and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Katherine Newman also submitted letters on this topic, independent of each other, which Chair Hoffman also asked to be entered into the record. Chair Hoffman then invited Deputy Commissioner Marshall to update the committee on the revised program approval process for public institutions.

Dr. Marshall began her presentation with an overview of all the public comments received. She separated the comments into those which had been satisfactorily addressed at the December and January AAC meetings and those which still need the committee's attention. The public comments still needing to be addressed were: 1) a possible contradiction between MGL Chapter 15A, Section 9 and MGL Chapter 75, Section 2 and the displacement of local board from preliminary review, 2) an absence of evaluation criteria, and 3) a lack of alignment between UMass, as a research institution, with its peer institutions across the country.

On the first point--whether the revised process displaces the local board from preliminary review--the staff recommended a revision to *The Revised Procedures for New Academic Programs* to state clearly that both the Letter of Intent (LOI) and the full proposal should be approved by the local campus board before being forwarded to the BHE. Dr. Marshall indicated that edits had been made to the draft document included in the Board packet to address this concern. She also stated that the potential actions by the Board at phase 1 of the proposed process had been clarified in the new draft document to include "approval" or "revise and resubmit." Regarding the second issue- the absence of evaluation criteria- Dr. Marshall stated that a draft LOI template, mirroring the content of the *Revised Procedures for New Academic Programs*, had been created and was also included in the Board materials for BHE review.

On the third issue--a potential lack of alignment between UMass and its peers- Dr. Marshall provided examples of common system-level best practice approaches at three UMass-selected peer institutions based on the UMass Report on Annual Indicators. These three institutions were the University of Illinois, the University of Maryland, and the University of Missouri. DHE staff examined three specific areas in these three university systems: 1) structure and authority, 2) process, and 3) criteria for evaluation. The reviews showed that the overarching structure of each state was different, while authority over program approval was relatively consistent. Dr. Marshall noted that in each system, the board's (or its equivalent) action occurs after the development of a full proposal and that Illinois is the only state that has something comparable to the LOI, with their notice of intent. In each state, the state authorizing agency retains authority over its public research institutions. Dr. Marshall then provided a comparison between the three UMass-selected peers and Massachusetts. In large part, the comparison showed an alignment of review criteria across the systems. Finally, Dr. Marshall provided a summary of the research outcomes, highlighting three additional points of interest. First, Maryland is the only system that included an explicit reference to an appeal process. Second, Illinois and Missouri have clearly defined regions and pay particular attention to the duplication of academic programs within the regions as a part of the program approval process. Third, with the exception of proposed areas of disinvestment, the criteria set forth in the revised process are well-aligned with those established by state systems governing peer institutions. At the conclusion of these observations, Dr. Marshall turned the meeting back to Committee Chair Hoffman.

Committee Chair Hoffman sought clarification about the point in the process when the boards in these peer states determined approval. Dr. Marshall responded that the other state boards act on full proposals. Vice Chair Sheila Harrity asked if Massachusetts had data on how many

program proposals were approved and/or disapproved in the other states. Dr. Marshall acknowledged the importance of this question and indicated that staff had not incorporated this question into the research on peer institutions and did not have that data. Committee Chair Hoffman noted that the program review criteria appeared to primarily focus on policy and asked where the committee wanted to end up. Vice Chair Harrity asked if other states have similar program approval structures. Dr. Marshall replied that the bifurcated governance structure stipulated in the expedited program approval process in Massachusetts is somewhat unique. Commissioner Santiago added that, in the two states with which he is most familiar, Wisconsin and New York, the educational segments are much more integrated. Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau stated that when it comes to program approval the Board has authority over all three segments per MGL Chapter 15A. Committee Chair Hoffman added that not all of our campuses are opposed to the suggested program review revisions, identifying support from many community colleges.

Committee Chair Hoffman then stated that she would allow public comment and invited UMass representative Katherine Newman, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, to address the Committee. Dr. Newman said the concern for the UMass system is that its board would not be comfortable giving approval to programs at the LOI stage because program proposals are not fully developed at that stage. Peer review has not yet taken place at this stage, and that is by design. Dr. Newman made clear that UMass respects and appreciates the BHE's program review for fully-developed programs, knowing such scrutiny adds value within the larger context of the higher education system. Dr. Newman expressed further appreciation for the revision to the proposed program approval process that eliminated the connection between the discontinuation of programs and the adoption of new ones. She also stated that UMass is willing to accept the risks inherent in the current program approval process, namely that a program may go through the entire process--review by DHE staff and external reviewers, program refinement, and approval by the campus board--and still not be approved by the BHE at the end.

Board Chair Gabrieli replied that the spirit in which the AAC came to the conclusion that the program review process needed to be revised was in recognition that public higher education is in a crisis with steep costs and a lack of accessibility, particularly for traditionally underserved groups, inadequate numbers of graduates in high-demand fields, and declining enrollment. He stated he found the letter of disagreement regarding the proposed revisions sent by Henry Thomas, BHE and UMass Board member, concerning, especially when the letter conveyed the assertion that the current program review process is working. Board Chair Gabrieli stated his disagreement and offered that, at least to his understanding, the BHE feels that it is not succeeding in addressing the crisis, and that part of that may be due to tired systems and processes. He noted the irony of the AAC considering a motion for approval of a UMass Boston (UMB) proposal later in the meeting, considering UMB's current fiscal situation. He stated that, in his opinion, a proliferation of programs at campuses has led, in part, to the growth in costs and that UMB's present proposal exemplified his larger concern that program proposals are disconnected from campus and system-wide strategic plans. Board Chair Gabrieli also stated that it is unfair and unreasonable for the Board to approve a program when it does not address how the program supports the overall higher education system. He stated that it is precisely for this reason that he believes the revised program review recommendations are important: the BHE should not be involved in deciding if a program is academically sound but rather deciding if a program is addressing higher strategic issues, and the new program review process is an attempt at giving the BHE less say on the academic substance of programs. Board Chair Gabrieli expressed concern that UMass would not want to review strategic implications and alignment of programs before the peer review process begins. Board Chair Gabrieli concluded

his remarks by referencing a program proposal recently advanced by UMass Dartmouth that he thought lacked sufficient rationale for program need on the south coast, yet was approved essentially because the program had already gone through the entire review process. Board Chair Gabrieli cited the prior UMass proposal as an example of the need to have greater dialogue and BHE input much earlier in the program review process.

Dr. Newman said she was not prepared to respond to the range of issues that Board Chair Gabrieli raised, especially with regard to matters that took place before she assumed her current role at UMass, but she shared his concern about proposals being sound and aligning with the strategic mission of the institution. She offered the possibility of applicants providing more strategic alignment information with the LOI. UMass would support the refinement of the LOI questions, so that ultimately the LOI would reflect that the academic worthiness of the program is conjoined with the strategic plan. She concluded that, if the LOI does not articulate what the BHE needs, then BHE should refine it to fit its needs.

Committee Chair Hoffman followed Dr. Newman's comments by stressing that second guessing peer review, as the BHE currently does, is not in the best interest of the Commonwealth or the use of the BHE's time. She felt that the BHE should be focusing its energy on strategic planning. Committee Chair Hoffman asked how UMass would solve the problem.

Dr. Newman replied that the UMass board would prefer that the BHE render its judgment when it has all the information about a proposed program at its disposal, as is the case with the current process. She commented that UMass is not sure what is broken with the current process. She also stated that the larger issues, including college affordability and access, brought up by Board Chair Gabrieli, would be more suitable for discussion in a different venue. Dr. Newman asserted that program review is not the appropriate lever for a discussion of public higher education strategies for the Commonwealth.

Committee Chair Hoffman then invited Dr. David Silva, Provost and Academic Vice President at Salem State University, to offer remarks. Referring to the Illinois model, Dr. Silva said that it was unusual and illogical to submit the program proposal with the LOI. Dr. Silva suggested that the BHE revisit the LOI and be clear about what the BHE is looking for from campuses, and then the campuses can provide that information up front and be more clear about the proposed program's alignment with the overall campus strategic plan. Dr. Silva invited the Committee to review the current process at the University of Texas where a statement of need and associated resources is required at the initial stages of program development.

Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau pointed out that the program review process in Illinois (which gives the option of submitting the LOI with the full proposal) is not dissimilar from the revised process that is being proposed in Massachusetts. He suggested that it would be the institution's prerogative to submit an entire proposal along with the LOI under the new process. Referring to the current process, Dr. Winifred Hagan pointed out that the comment period after the submission of the LOI allows all AICUM and public institutions to provide comment about the proposed program, which comments often influence the development of the proposal. Committee Chair Hoffman asked if the BHE could provide comment during this period as well. Dr. Hagan responded by saying this was a possibility, especially if Massachusetts puts the LOI out for comment on its website similar to the process in Illinois.

Board Chair Gabrieli pointed out that his earlier comments were a reflection of his passion for providing Massachusetts citizens with a top-rate education.. He again expressed concern that the proliferation of programs is a problem and a contributing factor to rising higher education

costs. Dr. Newman disagreed with this statement and indicated that the increased costs of higher education are attributable to multiple factors. Board Chair Gabrieli replied that he would be interested in reviewing the data on that point. He added that the BHE should consider disapproval at the LOI stage and expressed concern that UMass program proposals have not answered the question of whether the UMass board has considered how a new program will help the strategic goals of the Commonwealth's higher education system. He reiterated that the BHE is eager to learn if new programs will add value to the system earlier in the process than is currently the case, and that the BHE is prepared to render a decision earlier in the process because it is less interested in the academic program components and more about how the program integrates into the system. Board Chair Gabrieli concluded that a dialogue needs to happen.

Dr. Newman responded that a dialogue is welcome but added that she did not believe that the program approval process is the right place to debate the broader concerns about financial and structural problems in higher education.

Committee Chair Hoffman added that the purview of the AAC is academic policy, and a concern about the proliferation of programs is part of this purview, though she also agreed with Dr. Newman that perhaps the larger issues raised by the Board Chair would be better addressed in a different forum. Committee Chair Hoffman validated the importance of the larger issues and agreed the BHE needs to take a closer look at them. Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau added his observation that it might appear as though the BHE is leveraging the program approval process to advance larger goals and impose a strategic vision for the whole higher education system, but that that was not so. He expressed his belief that the appropriate role for the BHE is to look at the LOI and see if it could better express alignment with campus and state strategic plans. Mr. Moreau also explained that he interpreted Board Chair Gabrieli's comments as saying that program proliferation is not the cause of the problem of increasing cost of higher education but that it is a factor the BHE should consider as part of a broader conversation.

Vice Chair Harrity concluded the discussion by summarizing that the BHE's interest is in designing a process that does not result in the BHE only reviewing program proposals at the end, providing space for the BHE to be involved with connecting academic programs to workforce development and other broad and strategic concerns.

## **V. MOTIONS**

### **A. AAC 18-21 Revocation of the Degree Granting Authority of the New England Institute of Art, LLC**

Assistant General Counsel Ashley Wisneski presented the motion. New England Institute of Art was a for-profit institution of higher education owned and operated by Education Management Corporation. On April 22, 2015, due to decreasing student demand, as well as "changing conditions and external forces," NEIA's Board of Trustees voted to cease enrollment of new students and teach out the remaining NEIA students. NEIA also arranged transfer and articulation agreements for students with several local institutions and also provided the opportunity for students to complete their degree programs online through the Art Institute of Pittsburgh. BHE staff was notified of the planned closure and teach-out on May 5, 2015. The final students completed their programs by December 15, 2017.

Throughout the closure process, NEIA worked closely with BHE staff to ensure compliance with state requirements, including submitting quarterly reports as required throughout its teach-out, holding a public hearing, and publishing notice thereof. BHE staff recommends that the Board revoke the authority of the New England Institute of Art, LLC to grant degrees in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts retroactive to December 31, 2017.

Following the briefing, Vice Chair Harrity asked about the welfare of the students, specifically inquiring whether there were any students remaining in Massachusetts and requesting confirmation that all the students affected by the closure were appropriately served.

Ms. Wisneski replied that all the students' needs were met by the closure date at the end of December 2017. Most students ended up transferring to other institutions of higher education offering similar programs, though a smaller number of students elected to remain at NEIA because of comfort or, in the case of one audio program, a comparable program was not available at any other institution.

There being no further discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded, and approved unanimously by all board members present.

**AAC 18- 21    REVOCATION OF THE DEGREE GRANTING AUTHORITY OF THE NEW ENGLAND INSTITUTE OF ART, LLC**

**MOVED:**    The Board hereby revokes the legal authority of **The New England Institute of Art, LLC** to operate and grant degrees in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts retroactive to December 31, 2017.

Authority:    Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 69, Section 30 et seq.

Contact:    Winifred M. Hagan, Ed.D., Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs & Student Success  
Ashley H. Wisneski, Esq., Assistant General Counsel

**B. AAC 18-22                    Salem State University  
    Master of Science in Athletic Training**

Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Student Success Dr. Winifred Hagan presented the motion. Salem State University (SSU) plans that the proposed Master of Science in Athletic Training (MSAT) program will align with SSU's mission and current strategic plan. The existing undergraduate athletic training program at SSU has achieved regional and national recognition, positioning the proposed MSAT as an important asset that is intended to be a rigorous and specialized healthcare program. The Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) has increased its entry-level standards such that accredited professional athletic training programs must result in the granting of a master's degree in athletic training. The timeline for compliance with the higher standard stipulates that baccalaureate programs may not admit, enroll, or matriculate students into an undergraduate athletic training program after the start of the fall term 2022. The bachelor level athletic training program at SSU has graduated many first-generation college students, who have been well-prepared to be successful certified and licensed athletic trainers. The proposed program is intended to prepare students in the five domains of athletic training, which are: injury and illness prevention; clinical evaluation; diagnosis; treatment; and rehabilitation. CAATE requirements

stipulate alignment with detailed learning outcomes for which students must meet minimum clinical competency. It is intended that through course work and clinical experience, the proposed MSAT program will prepare students for a transition to autonomous clinical practice as certified and licensed athletic trainers.

The external reviewers found that the overall program design effectively accomplishes the program's goals and purposes and meets the standards of the accrediting body (CAATE). The curriculum was found to integrate both research and clinical practice with a strong emphasis on evidence-based practice. The review team noted that the ongoing plan for program assessment is comprehensive and assures stakeholders that program goals and objectives are being met. The reviewers recommended an additional full-time faculty member and emphasized that SSU students currently have the highest first-time pass rate for certification and a proven track record. They recommended that resources be specifically allocated to conference participation by faculty to promote the program within this field, as well as a comprehensive marketing plan to target regional and national prospective students. SSU responded favorably to all recommendations and incorporated them into the body of the proposal.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the proposed Master of Science in Athletic Training.

Committee Chair Hoffman opened the floor to questions. Board Member Reimers asked about the pay differential between a bachelor and master degree. He further inquired about industry need for this level of competence. Representatives from SSU responded saying labor research showed a sharp decline in demand for candidates with only a bachelor's degree; the industry is looking for master level candidates, and soon a bachelor's degree will not guarantee a job. Committee Chair Hoffman asked why the field is seeking this increase in credentials. Representatives from SSU responded that they had looked closely at that question and found that in part it appeared to be an effort to lower student loan debt because of the higher compensation graduates receive for a master's credential. Additionally, they stated, the industry is seeking higher skilled candidates; SSU compared the MSAT to other health fields, such as physical therapy, where master degrees are now a requirement for employment. Vice Chair Harrity asked about the pass rate in SSU's current undergraduate program. Representatives from SSU responded that the current pass rate is approximately 97%, while across the country the pass rate is much lower. Vice Chair Harrity expressed concern about whether the program would meet the needs of undergraduates and asked if the undergraduate program would continue. Representatives from SSU replied that the undergraduate program would continue but added that, due to the CAATE requirements, SSU is looking at converting the undergraduate program to a 3 + 2 model similar to UMass Lowell's physical therapy program, where a student would graduate with a bachelor's and a master's degree. Representatives from SSU also noted that multiple pathways for students interested in entering the program are being considered.

There being no further discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded, and approved unanimously by all board members present.

**AAC 18-22 APPLICATION FROM SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY TO AWARD THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ATHLETIC TRAINING**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education hereby approves the application of **Salem State University** to award the **Master of Science in Athletic Training**.

Upon graduating the first class for this program, Salem State University shall submit to the Board a status report addressing its success in reaching program

goals as stated in the application and in the areas of enrollment, curriculum, faculty resources, and program effectiveness.

Authority: Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 15A, §9(b).

Contact: Winifred M. Hagan, Ed.D. Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs & Student Success

**C. AAC 18-23                      University of Massachusetts Boston  
Bachelor of Arts in Sport Leadership**

Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Student Success Dr. Winifred Hagan presented the motion. The University of Massachusetts Boston (UMB) is a public research university with a special commitment to urban and global engagement. The proposed Bachelor of Arts in Sport Leadership (BASL) program is aligned with this mission and designed to attract students who are interested in sports-related careers. It is intended that the proposed program will provide students with an opportunity to learn about the global sport industry and the practice of sport in developmental, psychological, interpersonal, and sociological contexts framed within a social justice mission. The BASL is especially significant because of the compelling interest it is expected to hold for students who need incentive, direction, and motivation to engage and succeed in higher education. It is intended to attract students with an interest in careers providing service to the diverse population of Boston, and it is expected that graduates of the proposed program will serve the city through engagement in outreach activities. The proposed program is expected to prepare students for leadership positions by studying sport and the sport industry and to gain specific skills related to the sport industry and thus provide students with a competitive career advantage. It is intended that students will develop confidence, self-awareness, and a clear focus on social justice and responsibility. UMB intends that graduates will be prepared for careers in sports organizations, sports marketing firms, sports leagues, front offices of sports teams, college athletic departments, licensing and apparel marketing, radio and television programming, events and facilities management, sports labor relations, sports community relations, and sports-related philanthropic organizations. Additionally, the proposed program is also intended to provide a pathway to graduate study in a variety of sports-centered fields. The proposed program's emphasis on opportunities for underrepresented groups through an experience-oriented curriculum is designed to support industry efforts to recruit a more diversified work force, and it is intended to produce more female leaders and leaders of color.

The proposed program was reviewed by experts from the Sport Business Management program at the University of Central Florida, the National Consortium for Academics and Sport, and the Sport and Leisure Management program at the University of Memphis, including a site visit to UMB as part of the joint review. The review team expects strong demand for the proposed program. They viewed the program's emphasis on leadership combined with social justice as both admirable and aligned precisely with the urban, public, higher education mission of UMB. The review team found the proposed goals to be well-conceived and commended UMB for the ongoing assessment strategy. They found the program curriculum to be comprehensive, well-constructed, sequenced, and clearly nested within the goals. The reviewers repeatedly noted the strength of the curricular emphasis on leadership combined with social justice, which will "create leaders who will stand up for social justice rather than stand in its way." The reviewers further identified the cohort experience during the first and second years to be valuable in contributing to the success of students. They underscored that the seminars will create early momentum in students' academic careers and will help engage and prepare students for the

rigorous curriculum offerings provided in years 3 and 4. The review team saw value added by advisory board members providing internships, engaging as mentors and speakers, and assisting with recruiting and external partners. The diversity of the UMB student body was identified as a strong asset that will make graduates competitive in the marketplace. The external reviewers made recommendations to ensure institutional commitment to the program; to obtain accreditation by year 5; and to increase the salary for the endowed chair position. UMB concurred with the external reviewers recommendations and made changes to the proposal prior to submitting it to the BHE for review.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Sport Leadership program.

Committee Chair Hoffman opened the floor to questions. Board Member Reimers asked what particular occupational categories exist within this degree. Dr. Hagan referred Board Member Reimers to the first page of the staff report where such categories as sports organizations, sports marketing firms, sports leagues, sports teams' front office, college athletic departments, licensing, radio and television programming, and other career possibilities are listed. Board Member Reimers next inquired if the review had encompassed an analysis of whether other, existing degrees fulfilled the required skills necessary at the particular jobs for which degree candidates would be eligible. Dr. Hagan replied that the review looked at other models, such as the one at the University of Central Florida, which provided a model of the program's value, and she invited UMB representatives to provide input. Emily McDermott, UMB Provost, replied that the vast majority of jobs that Dr. Hagan referenced would be available to students who complete the BASL. Dr. McDermott also added that the BASL degree provides graduates with skills to work with youth, schools, and a host of non-profits where leadership skills are in demand and that members of the program's advisory committee, which is populated by a host of elite industry representatives, validated the need for it based upon their experience in the field. She noted that the advisory group found UMB, as a predominantly minority campus, had the diverse population to produce the type of candidates the industry seeks.

Board Member Reimers inquired if UMB considered the program's overall design in the development of this major. He stated that he was troubled that, given the focus on working with youth, he did not see the inclusion of any human development courses. Dr. McDermott replied that the curriculum does include human development courses with a strong focus on adolescent development.

Vice Chair Harrity expressed her agreement with Board Member Reimers regarding potential redundancy in skill development with other degrees UMB already offers. She also asked which course the program offers to help students build leadership skills. Dr. McDermott replied that the program includes courses in management, marketing and finance. She also added that the program provides a liberal arts degree perspective which provides students with the skills for looking at sports not only from a sports practitioner perspective but, more importantly, from the theoretical perspective of economics, equality, justice, and other important civic society functions. In addition, she noted that all accepted general education courses count towards the completion of the degree.

Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau offered that the endowed chair of the new program, someone who has not yet been chosen, will presumably resolve any outstanding concerns by refining the program and finalizing the details. Mr. Moreau then directed the AAC's attention to the curriculum outline on page 11 of the motion. Katherine Newman, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs at UMass, stated that the program proposal that she and Dr.

McDermott were referring to did not include a grid on page 11, raising a question about the documents that the Committee was reviewing. Committee Chair Hoffman stated that the Committee might want to table the motion until all members possessed the correct documents. Dr. Hagan clarified for members of the Committee that their packets include a staff report as part of the motion and not the full program proposal that the institution submits. The Committee determined that the confusion regarding page numbers could be attributed to the fact that UMass representatives were looking at the full proposal, while committee members were referencing the staff report included as part of the motion. Dr. Hagan said she could send the full proposals to all committee members to resolve the problem.

Dr. McDermott asked if she could address Board Chair Gabrieli's earlier concern about UMB's financial situation. Dr. McDermott shared that UMB had held back many program proposals precisely because of overall financial considerations at UMB but, in the case of the proposed BASL, the proposal had been moved forward because the program includes an endowed chair. She indicated that the program will have no negative impact on the school's finances and that it strongly aligns with UMB's mission and will serve its diverse student body.

Committee Chair Hoffman accepted Dr. Hagan's offer to provide the committee with UMB's full proposal. Board Chair Gabrieli added that, since there remained some confusion about the program requirements and curriculum, the Committee should table the motion until its next AAC meeting. He added that the delay would also provide the Committee time to consider the financial implications of the program and ask for additional information. Committee Chair Hoffman asked UMB representatives if delaying action on the BASL proposal would negatively impact the program. Representatives from UMB responded affirmatively, saying that a delay would negatively impact their planned actions. Commissioner Santiago pointed out that DHE staff always provide the Committee with a staff report, rather than the full proposal, to lessen the burden on the Committee while sharpening the focus on the important details of the proposed programs.

Committee members discussed alternatives on how to proceed, including moving forward without a recommendation and/ or asking for additional information. In order to advance the motion for consideration by the BHE at its meeting the following week, Committee Chair Hoffman suggested amending the motion to require additional information from DHE staff and UMB. There was discussion regarding the language of the revised motion. Based upon concerns expressed by Committee members related to the structure of the program, the employability of graduates, and the financial situation at UMB, Committee Chair Hoffman recommended advancing AAC 18-23 to the BHE without recommendation and pending receipt of further documentation related to said concerns. To that end, the following oral motion was duly made, seconded and approved unanimously by all board members present.

**AAC 18-23 APPLICATION FROM UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON TO AWARD THE BACHELOR OF ARTS IN SPORT LEADERSHIP**

**MOVED:** The AAC hereby advances the Application from University of Massachusetts Boston to Award the Bachelor of Arts in Sport Leadership to the BHE for consideration at its next meeting without recommendation, pending additional information on program requirements, evidence of sufficient rigor for career preparation, and a summary memo of how to view this application in the context of the financial challenges faced by UMass Boston.

Authority: Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 15A, §9(b).

Contact: Winifred M. Hagan, Ed.D. Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs & Student Success.

**D. AAC 18-25 Approval and Adoption of 610 CMR 12.00: Operation of Massachusetts Degree-Granting Institutions under the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)**

In the interest of time, Commissioner Santiago requested to give a high-level overview of the next two motions relating to the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). He summarized the background information, the need for new regulations to govern the Commonwealth's entry into SARA, and the BHE's ability to set fees for institutions seeking approval to operate under SARA. Board Chair Gabrieli suggested that, given the importance of SARA, the motions should be carried over and discussed at the full BHE meeting rather than being rushed through; however, the remainder of the Committee members expressed their belief that discussion on the motions would be minimal and that a vote should proceed.

Ashley Wisneski, Assistant General Counsel, provided a brief overview of the regulatory process and stated that the changes to the regulations from the first version reviewed and approved by the BHE were minimal and reflected the limited public comment received.

There being no further discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded, and approved unanimously by all board members present.

**AAC 18-25 APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF 610 CMR 12.00: OPERATION OF MASSACHUSETTS DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS UNDER THE STATE AUTHORIZATION RECIPROcity AGREEMENT (SARA)**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education, in accordance with M.G.L. c. 15A, § 9 and c. 69 § 31A, and having solicited and reviewed public comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, M.G.L. c. 30A, § 3, hereby adopts the following regulations: Operation of Massachusetts Degree-Granting Institutions Under the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), to be codified at 610 CMR 12.00.

Authority: M.G.L. c. 15A, § 9, as amended by 2017 Mass. Acts ch. 47, § 10; M.G.L. c. 69, § 31A, as amended by 2017 Mass. Acts ch. 47, § 36; M.G.L. c. 15A, § 41; M.G.L. c. 30A; 950 CMR 20.00

Contact: Constantia T. Papanikolaou, General Counsel  
Patricia A. Marshall, Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs & Student Success

**E. AAC 18-26 Fee Schedule for Massachusetts Institutions Seeking Approval to Operate under the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)**

There being no discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded, and approved unanimously by all board members present.

**AAC 18-08 FEE SCHEDULE FOR MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTIONS SEEKING APPROVAL TO OPERATE UNDER THE STATE AUTHORIZATION RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT (SARA)**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education adopts the following state annual fee schedule for Massachusetts-based institutions that apply to the Department for approval to operate under SARA.

<b>Institution's total full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment as reported in the Federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS)*</b>	<b>Total Annual Fee</b>
Community Colleges	\$0
Under 2,500 FTE	\$3,000
2,500-9,999 FTE	\$6,000
10,000-19,999 FTE	\$9,000
20,000 or more FTE	\$12,000

Authority: M.G.L. c. 15A, § 9, as amended by 2017 Mass. Acts ch. 47, § 10; M.G.L. c. 69, § 31A, as amended by 2017 Mass. Acts ch. 47, § 36; M.G.L. c. 15A, § 41

Contact: Constantia T. Papanikolaou, General Counsel  
Patricia A. Marshall, Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs & Student Success

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

There was no other business.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

On a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.