

**BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**December 15, 2005**

The December 15, 2005, meeting of the Board of Higher Education (BHE) was held at Massachusetts Bay Community College in Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts. The following members were present:

Stephen P. Tocco, Chair  
Aaron Spencer, Vice Chair  
G. L. (Peter) Alcock  
Jeanne-Marie Boylan  
John Brockelman  
Kathleen Kelley

Amanda Lacouture  
Casey Otis  
Richard Taylor  
Carole Thomson  
Karl White

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Tocco called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

A motion was made to accept the minutes of the November 17, 2005, Board meeting. The motion was seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

**WELCOME**

Dr. Carole Berotte Joseph, President of Massachusetts Bay Community College, welcomed the Board. She presented a brief history of the College, from its opening in 1961 to the present which now includes the additional campuses in Framingham and Ashland.

President Berotte Joseph mentioned recent regional collaboration efforts of the College in the Welcome Back Program and the Hurricane Katrina effort. The College's priorities center on planning, assessment and community outreach activities, with planning efforts focused on strategic planning, technology planning and facilities master planning.

**CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS**

Chancellor Gill stated that she would like to use her time to focus on the budget formula. The details of the fiscal year 2007 budget request will be discussed later in the meeting by Associate Vice Chancellor Kurt Steinberg. Last year the funding formula for higher education was used by the Governor and the Legislature in the development of their respective budgets. This was the first time both the executive and legislative branches made use of the formula, and it is important that this trend continue. The budget formula provides an equitable approach to funding public higher education, and it recognizes the impact of variables, such as enrollment and physical plant. The FY07 budget request addresses parity and the closing of the funding gap as well as increasing financial aid. The Chancellor stated this is an important year to fully establish the budget formula approach as the accepted approach to funding. She concluded by pledging her support to working with the higher education presidents and chancellors in the coming months to support formula funding and closing the funding gap.

**MOTIONS**

Chair Tocco brought forth the following motion, which was seconded and unanimously approved.

**BHE 06-09 AMENDED REPORT FROM THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: PRESIDENTIAL COMPENSATION**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education approves the attached amended Report and Recommendations (BHE 06-09 [o-r]) of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9(q)  
**Contact:** Judith I. Gill, Chancellor

John Brockelman, Chair of the Assessment and Accountability Committee, introduced the following motion, which was seconded and unanimously approved.

**AAC 06-06 APPROVAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS AT BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education approves the **Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice** and the **Master of Science in Criminal Justice** at **Bridgewater State College** under the *Guidelines for Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Academic Programs*. The programs have been found to meet or exceed all quality standards established by the *Guidelines*.

As stated in the *Guidelines*, the institution shall submit two copies of a report to the Board annually, certifying that each program is being maintained and operated within the provisions and spirit of the criteria and guidelines set forth by the *Guidelines*.

**Authority:** Chapter 41, Section 108L (as amended)  
**Contact:** Aundrea Kelley, Associate Chancellor for Academic Policy

Chair Tocco congratulated Bridgewater State College for its work on this program. He said that the campuses' criminal justice programs are models for other states to follow.

Aaron Spencer, Chair of the Fiscal Affairs and Administrative Policy Committee, introduced Kurt Steinberg, Associate Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Affairs and Administrative Policy, who thanked campus personnel for their support and help in preparation of the budget that requests \$1,082 million, a 6 percent increase over last year's budget. The budget formula proposes to close the parity gap in five years and the revenue gap in seven years. The budget includes the following initiatives:

- Financial aid
- Nursing and allied health education
- Private sector fund raising incentive
- Program management and outreach
- Graduation task force recommendations
- State and community college collective bargaining
- Dual Enrollment

Ms. Kelley asked how many students are left behind because of the financial aid funding deficit. Mr. Steinberg answered that this was being determined by the Task Force, which will present its

report to the Board in April 2006. Chair Tocco added that the Legislature and the Administration are being made aware that sufficient financial aid is a high priority.

Chair Tocco reported that downward revenue projections are raising anxiety among Legislators, and the Board must face fierce competition for funding. While we try to overcome a \$700 million gap, it would be very difficult to contend with a year of reduced funding. Economic indicators point to a 2.5 year window for us to provide quality, affordable higher education. He said that it is critical for the public higher education system to band together to promote the need for higher education funding. He appealed to the Board to engage in the process of convincing the Legislature of the importance of public higher education. In conclusion, Chair Tocco thanked Mr. Steinberg and Board staff for its superlative work in preparing the budget.

Mr. Spencer brought forth the following motion, which was seconded and unanimously approved.

**FAAP 06-06 BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET REQUEST**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education hereby adopts the attached budget request for Fiscal Year 2007:

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15 A, Section 15

**Contact:** Kurt T. Steinberg, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

**Massachusetts Board of Higher Education  
FY07 Budget Request**

		(\$ in thousands)		Variance	
		FY07	FY06	\$	%
<b>Central Accounts</b>					
7066-0000	Board of Higher Education	3,246	2,149	1,097	51.0%
7066-0005	Compact for Higher Education	124	62	62	100.3%
7066-0009	New England Board of Higher Education	417	417	-	0.0%
7066-0015	Community College Training Grants	2,900	2,900	-	0.0%
7066-0016	Foster Care Financial Aid	1,200	1,200	-	0.0%
7070-0031	McNair Program	1,966	1,966	-	0.0%
7070-0065	Scholarship Reserve (Financial Aid)	104,673	84,673	20,000	23.6%
7077-0023	Tufts Veterinary	4,054	4,054	-	0.0%
7520-0424	Colleges Health and Welfare	4,823	3,850	973	25.3%
	Private Sector Fund-Raising Incentive Program	9,000	-	9,000	
	Graduation Rate Task Force: Implementation	1,500	-	1,500	
	Nursing & Allied Health Grant Program	4,000	500	3,500	
	Dual Enrollment	2,000	-	2,000	
<b>Central Accounts Sub-Total</b>		<b>139,904</b>	<b>101,772</b>	<b>38,132</b>	<b>37.5%</b>

**FY07 Budget Request**

		(\$ in thousands)		Variance	
		FY07	FY06	\$	%
<b>Community Colleges</b>					
7502-0100	Berkshire Community College	8,648	8,226	422	5.1%
7503-0100	Bristol Community College	14,890	13,687	1,203	8.8%
7518-0100	Bunker Hill Community College	19,078	17,698	1,380	7.8%
7504-0100	Cape Cod Community College	10,513	9,830	683	6.9%
7504-0101	Cape Cod Environmental Technology Training	124	124	-	0.0%
7505-0100	Greenfield Community College	8,583	8,063	521	6.5%
7506-0100	Holyoke Community College	17,288	15,974	1,314	8.2%
7507-0100	Massachusetts Bay Community College	13,342	12,287	1,056	8.6%
7508-0100	Massasoit Community College	18,952	17,407	1,545	8.9%
7516-0100	Middlesex Community College	18,538	16,980	1,558	9.2%
7516-0200	Middlesex - Bay State Reading	1,000	1,000	-	0.0%
7509-0100	Mt. Wachusett Community College	12,053	10,427	1,626	15.6%
7511-0100	North Shore Community College	18,655	17,638	1,017	5.8%
7511-0101	North Shore Community College Institute	250	250	-	0.0%
7510-0100	Northern Essex Community College	17,934	16,554	1,380	8.3%
7512-0100	Quinsigamond Community College	14,007	12,975	1,032	8.0%
7515-0100	Roxbury Community College	9,829	9,266	563	6.1%
7515-0120	Roxbury 1) Reggie Lewis Track Ops	946	946	-	0.0%
7515-0121	Roxbury 2) Reggie Lewis Track Retained Rev	530	530	-	0.0%
7514-0100	Springfield Technical Community College	22,855	20,720	2,134	10.3%
7514-0102	STCC - Mass Center for Tele & Info Tech	535	535	-	0.0%
<b>Community College Sub-Total</b>		<b>228,550</b>	<b>211,118</b>	<b>17,432</b>	<b>8.3%</b>

**FY07 Budget Request**

	(\$ in thousands)		Variance	
	FY07	FY06	\$	%
<b>State Colleges</b>				
7109-0100 Bridgewater State College	35,618	34,153	1,465	4.3%
7110-0100 Fitchburg State College	26,186	24,214	1,972	8.1%
7112-0100 Framingham State College	23,278	20,541	2,737	13.3%
7117-0100 Mass College of Art	12,920	11,167	1,752	15.7%
7113-0100 Mass College of Liberal Arts	13,349	12,660	689	5.4%
7118-0100 Mass Maritime Academy	12,262	11,108	1,154	10.4%
7114-0100 Salem State College	34,091	32,502	1,589	4.9%
7114-0101 Salem State 1) GTE/Sylvania Property O&M	701	701	-	0.0%
7114-0105 Salem State 2) Aquaculture	200	200	-	0.0%
7114-0106 Salem State 3) 2nd Nursing Program	916	916	-	0.0%
7115-0100 Westfield State College	21,588	20,185	1,403	7.0%
7116-0100 Worcester State College	21,239	20,502	737	3.6%
7116-0101 WOR - Latino Education Institute	200	200	-	0.0%
71160105 WOR - State Matching Grant (athletic field)	-	-	-	
<b>State College Sub-Total</b>	<b>202,547</b>	<b>189,048</b>	<b>13,499</b>	<b>7.1%</b>

**FY07 Budget Request**

	(\$ in thousands)		Variance	
	FY07	FY06	\$	%
<b>University of Massachusetts</b>				
7100-0200 University of Massachusetts Operations	435,478	408,820	26,658	6.5%
7100-0300 Toxics Use Reduction Institute Program	1,240	1,240	-	0.0%
7100-0350 Toxics Use Reduction Study	250	250	-	0.0%
7100-0500 Commonwealth College	3,430	3,430	-	0.0%
7100-0700 U Mass Boston - Dispute Resolution	166	166	-	0.0%
1599-7104 New Bedford College of Performing Arts	2,565	2,565	-	0.0%
1599-3857 Fall River ATMC (Kerr Mill)	1,300	1,300	-	0.0%
<b>University of Massachusetts Sub-Total</b>	<b>444,430</b>	<b>417,772</b>	<b>26,658</b>	<b>6.4%</b>
<b>Total FY07 Budget Request</b>	<b>1,015,431</b>	<b>919,709</b>	<b>95,721</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
State & Community College Collective Bargaining FY06	-	7,931		
State & Community College Collective Bargaining FY07	10,707	-		

Aaron Spencer introduced the following three motions.

Mr. Steinberg explained that the following study is self-funded and a priority for the campus. This motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**FAAP 06-07 APPROVAL TO PROCEED WITH A WESTFIELD STATE COLLEGE ACADEMIC BUILDING STUDY**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education hereby gives Westfield State College approval to proceed with an academic building study. This approval is given with the understanding that Westfield State College is responsible for all costs related to the study and that it will not proceed with design and/or construction until the Board of Higher Education gives its approval to proceed.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9  
**Contact:** Kurt T. Steinberg, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

Mr. Steinberg advised that the FAAP 06-08 motion pertains to the critical issue of the physical condition of the Library. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**FAAP 06-08 APPROVAL TO PROCEED WITH A SALEM STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY RENOVATION STUDY**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education hereby gives Salem State College approval to Proceed with a library renovation study. This approval is given with the understanding that Salem State College is responsible for all costs related to the study and that it will not proceed with design and/or construction until the Board of Higher Education gives its approval to proceed.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9  
**Contact:** Kurt T. Steinberg, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

Edward Adelman, Executive Director of the Massachusetts State College Building Authority, stated that the following motion is a continuation of the five-year plan of adaptation and renewal. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**FAAP 06-09 APPROVAL OF MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE BUILDING AUTHORITY PROJECTS PERTAINING TO RESIDENCE HALLS**

**MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE BUILDING AUTHORITY REPAIR AND RENOVATION OF RESIDENCE HALLS (FY '07)**

**MOVED:** The Chancellor of the System of Public Higher Education (the "Chancellor") is authorized and directed in the name and on behalf of the Board of Higher Education (the "Board") to make a written request to the Massachusetts State College Building Authority (the "Authority") that the Authority initiate the projects described in EXHIBIT A attached hereto.

1. Bonds issued by the Authority to finance the projects for which a request is hereby authorized may be issued together with or separately from bonds

issued to carry out other projects of the Authority for which the Board authorizes a request.

2. The Chancellor and all other officers of the Board, each acting singly, are authorized to request the Commissioner of Administration to approve in writing the initiation by the Authority of the projects for which a request is hereby authorized, and to do such other things and to take such other action as the officer so acting shall, as conclusively evidenced by the taking of such action, deem necessary or desirable to be done or taken to carry into effect the matters hereby authorized.
3. The Chancellor of the System of Public Higher Education (the "Chancellor") is authorized and directed in the name and on behalf of the Board of Higher Education (the "Board") to make a written request to the Massachusetts State College Building Authority (the "Authority") that the Authority initiate the projects described in EXHIBIT A attached hereto.
4. Bonds issued by the Authority to finance the projects for which a request is hereby authorized may be issued together with or separately from bonds issued to carry out other projects of the Authority for which the Board authorizes a request.
5. The Chancellor and all other officers of the Board, each acting singly, are authorized to request the Commissioner of Administration to approve in writing the initiation by the Authority of the projects for which a request is hereby authorized, and to do such other things and to take such other action as the officer so acting shall, as conclusively evidenced by the taking of such action, deem necessary or desirable to be done or taken to carry into effect the matters hereby authorized.
6. The Board and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, acting by and through the Board, declare their official intent under §1.150-2(d)(1) and (e) of the Treasury Regulations as follows:

The Board reasonably expects that there shall be reimbursed from the proceeds of bonds issued by the Authority, expenditures (including expenditures made within the last 60 days) temporarily advanced by the Commonwealth (including within such term the Board and the State Colleges) for the projects for which a written request is hereby authorized, the maximum principal amount of such bonds expected to be issued, all or a portion of the proceeds of which are reasonably expected to be used for such reimbursement purposes, being \$12,200,000.

**Authority:** MGL Chapter 15A, Section 6, MGL Chapter 73 app.  
**Contact:** Kurt T. Steinberg, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Tocco reported that the Board of Trustees of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy had voted on December 4, 2005, to remove Admiral Richard G. Gurnon, as President. The

Chairman called on Arthur Desrocher, Chair, Massachusetts Maritime Academy (MMA), who read a prepared statement.

He described President Gurnon's employment position at MMA as an employee at will. In this capacity, President Gurnon serves at the pleasure of the MMA board of trustees. At a special meeting held on December 4, the MMA Board voted 9 to 1 that it lacked confidence in President Gurnon's leadership and 9 to 1 to dismiss him from his position as President. Mr. Desrocher requested that the BHE approve the decision of the MMA board.

Chair Desrocher said that the Board has sought to avoid publicity and to minimize damage to the Academy and to President Gurnon's reputation; any publicity has been a result of President Gurnon and his supporters. He cited information about allegations of sexual misconduct at the Academy made public as "an act of the greatest irresponsibility...made to further the ambitions of President Gurnon and his proponents." Regarding the allegations of sexual misconduct at the Academy, Chair Desrocher said that the Academy is "vigorously investigating the allegation in question" and will follow the course of action dictated by the findings.

Chair Desrocher dismissed as false the rumor that the board of trustees wishes to alter the mission of the Academy. He stated that the issues of hours of operation at the Academy pub, management of student accounts, and certain personnel issues had no bearing on the dismissal of the President. He reiterated that the reason that the MMA board of trustees dismissed President Gurnon was solely based on its lack of confidence in his leadership and distrust in his judgment. He cited President Gurnon's lack of listening skills, closed-mindedness, and the attitude that "he is always right," as "disrespectful to all at the Academy." He stated that when the President did not agree with trustee policy, he ignored the position of the trustees. He cited as examples the fact that that President Gurnon had not scheduled a board retreat and that he had not taken appropriate action when a faculty member had struck a cadet.

Chair Desrocher's stated that the board finds the current state of affairs at the Academy to be "dysfunctional and intolerable" and that the board of trustees does not wish to place at risk the Academy's "present eminence and its prospects for future success."

He concluded his statement by announcing—much to his regret—that he had learned yesterday that the request of other board members to speak was not approved. He then submitted the written statements of Board members, John L. Linnon and Jay Austin, and appealed to the Board of Higher Education to endorse the MMA board of trustees' decision to dismiss President Gurnon.

Chair Tocco, on behalf of the Board, received the statements of Messrs. Linnon and Austin.

Addressing his comments to Chair Desrocher, Chair Tocco said that the BHE is statutorily responsible for acting on the MMA board decision. Further, the BHE, as a matter of law, must not merely rubber stamp the trustees' decision but must act with due diligence. He reminded Chair Desrocher that in June, as MMA Chair, he had come to the BHE with a unanimous vote to appoint Richard Gurnon as president; a man who had been employed by the Academy for 27 years, and who had served as Interim President for two years. He asked Chair Desrocher what had changed to cause the Board to vote for his removal after only six months. Chair Tocco stated that he could find no prior documentation by the MMA Board of Trustees regarding any problems involving President Gurnon.

Board member Peter Alcock joined the discussion by asking Chair Desrocher to explain the selection process that led to President Gurnon's appointment. Chair Desrocher explained that after President Bresnahan's death, a presidential search committee was established. In retrospect, he said that he thought it might have been better if a national search firm had been used. Six individuals applied for the position of president and three were chosen as finalists. President Gurnon was elected on a 6 to 5 vote. Following the practice of giving a unanimous vote to a new president, a second vote was taken, and Gurnon was unanimously appointed.

Board member John Brockelman, citing the only compelling reason—lack of confidence—for President Gurnon's dismissal, asked Chair Desrocher to describe the process of President Gurnon's dismissal and inquired if President Gurnon had been given an opportunity to respond. Chair Desrocher replied that he visited the Academy every Tuesday and informed Gurnon of growing concerns among trustees. Approximately six weeks before the trustee vote, Mr. Desrocher and Vice Chair McNally told President Gurnon that the majority of the MMA Board wanted to dismiss him due to lack of confidence in his ability to lead the Academy.

Board member Kathleen Kelley asked Chair Desrocher if the Academy had a written evaluation system and if the trustees had formally evaluated the president's performance on requests they had made to him. Chair Desrocher answered that there was no paper trail or written evaluation.

Chair Tocco asked Chair Desrocher about a non-posted MMA board of trustees meeting that was held, according to a witness, in President Gurnon's office when he was away on a business trip. Chair Desrocher answered that this meeting did not take place, and Chair Tocco said that he would check again with his source.

Vice Chair Aaron Spencer stated that he was troubled by the MMA trustee vote to dismiss President Gurnon, especially since he had served for two years as Interim President. He said that if he were President Gurnon, he would have wanted to know what led the MMA board to its decision to dismiss him. Mr. Spencer then quoted a passage from the *Declaration of Independence* regarding the "decent respect for the opinions of mankind that requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

Chair Desrocher informed the Board that President Gurnon was Interim President when Admiral Bresnahan was still alive and making decisions. He said that once Richard Gurnon became President, there was "a change in the man," a man he had known for 23 years.

Vice-Chair Spencer said that he had a problem with the lack of process in President Gurnon's dismissal. He said that the reasons Chair Desrocher offered for President Gurnon's dismissal were small and that he frankly expected "blockbuster" reasons. He said he wanted to go on record in disapproving of the lack of due process that had been afforded President Gurnon.

Chair Tocco summarized the situation: President Gurnon, is an Annapolis graduate, and 27-year employee of MMA and an Interim President of MMA for two years. Following a unanimous vote to approve his appointment as President, the MMA trustees then vote for his dismissal six months later. The Board had no written documentation of problems with the President's performance. The Board's action was taken 30 days before the training ship is scheduled to ship out and two weeks before final exams. The meeting to hire the president took place at a special meeting that was held on a Sunday morning. Chair Tocco described the process as irresponsible.

Chairman Tocco stated that he would take testimony from individuals who had submitted written requests to address the Board of Higher Education. He began with MMA Trustee Lisa Gusmini, the only MMA board member to vote in opposition to President Gurnon's dismissal.

Ms Gusmini came forward to address the Board. She stated that everyone deserves to know why the action to dismiss President Gurnon was taken, and it is the MMA board's obligation to be fair. She confirmed that an official notice of President Gurnon's performance was never given to MMA trustees, nor was there official notification of a MMA board meeting, held on November 15, 2005, when President Gurnon was away on a business trip. She called the process by which President Gurnon was dismissed as "unacceptable."

President Gurnon thanked the Board for allowing him to speak. He told the Board that the MMA Chair and Vice Chair offered him an ultimatum: either resign or be fired. He reported that, though he asked, he was never told why he was dismissed. MMA trustees told him that he was being fired because the MMA Board lacked confidence in his ability as President. He spoke of the Board's possible violation of the open meeting law related to a MMA board meeting that took place in his office on November 15, 2005, and the havoc that has been created on campus just prior to cadets' exams and sea term. He declared the MMA's decision to dismiss him was "arbitrary and capricious." He recounted that the MMA Board, without explanation, also demanded, and received, the resignation of Captain Allen Hansen, MMA's Vice President for Student Services. He said that Mr. Hansen has been unfairly tarnished by these recent events.

Chair Tocco asked President Gurnon if he was aware of the split among Board members in their choice as President. President Gurnon stated that he was, but that he never thought it would turn into a "Hatfield versus McCoys" situation. Regarding the organization of the MMA board retreat, he replied that board relations were the responsibility of Chair Desrocher and that the president's job was to "run the Academy." Chair Tocco asked him why he was fired, and President Gurnon replied, "I do not know."

Board member Kathleen Kelly asked President Gurnon when he was fired, and he reported that he was dismissed on Sunday, December 4, 2005, at 10 a.m. She also asked if he had received a written performance evaluation, to which President Gurnon replied that he had not. He added that he had been told by Chair Desrocher, that "You just don't listen."

Board member Richard Taylor asked President Gurnon to explain more about the real estate decision described in MMA Board member Jay Austin's letter. President Gurnon explained that the real estate decision was made by the MMA Foundation, not by the Academy's administration.

Board member John Brockelman asked President Gurnon if he had spoken with MMA trustees after the posting of the December 4, 2005, meeting. He responded that after he had returned from his meeting in Texas, he knew he was "a dead man walking."

Mr. Geoffrey Wilkinson, a 1972 graduate and immediate past Chair of MMA, addressed the Board. He has served MMA as chair of the Board of Trustees, a member of the MMA Foundation, and a member of many MMA committees. He listed fund raising accomplishments under President Gurnon's leadership and how the dismissal has jeopardized future efforts. Mr. Wilkinson pointed out that President Gurnon's dismissal was particularly disruptive, as accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) and the Academy's winter commencement are about to occur. He further asserted that the Board of

Trustees was in violation of the open meeting law on for a meeting held but not posted on November 15, 2005, as well as the December 4, 2005, breakfast meeting. He stated that the MMA board's micromanagement of the Academy at all levels is wreaking havoc and a recipe for disaster. In conclusion, he petitioned the Board to return President Gurnon to his leadership position.

James Fox, a 1964 graduate and past President of the Alumni Association, past member and Chair of the MMA board of trustees, and present member of the MMA Foundation, addressed the Board. Mr. Fox acknowledged that MMA had experienced its fair share of problems over the years but has experienced far fewer problems than most other colleges. He told the Board that the members of the MMA Foundation would have welcomed a phone call from Chair Desrocher but did not receive one. Mr. Fox reported that President Gurnon has the support of the MMA Foundation, the union representation, alumni, faculty, and students. He reported, further, that PricewaterhouseCoopers, whose auditors recently completed an audit at the Academy, gave it an A+ rating. In closing, Mr. Fox asked the Board to deny the MMA's recommendation to dismiss President Gurnon, and he asked Governor Romney to demand the resignation of the entire MMA Board, with the exception of Ms. Lisa Gusmini.

Captain William H. Doherty, Master Mariner and Marine Consultant, spoke next. A 1967 and 1990 graduate of MMA, he also served as an Associate Professor at MMA. He said he came prepared today to offer his wholehearted support for the action taken by the MMA board on December 4, 2005. He said that after listening to the speakers, he could no longer do so.

Gerald Concannon, Professor of Humanities, and a MMA employee for 32 years, addressed the Board. He said that while he and many of his colleagues had supported another candidate for the position of President, he acknowledged that he was surprised by the MMA Board's dismissal of President Gurnon. He said that that President Gurnon is an honorable man, and he liked to think that all of the MMA board members were honorable, too. Since they could not resolve their differences, it falls upon the BHE to do so, and he asked the Board to apply a high moral and ethical standard to its decision.

Musa G. Pam, an Academy graduate and Secretary of the MMA Student Government Association in 1993-94, thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He voiced his support of President Gurnon, whom, he said has devoted 27 years of his professional life to the mission (which he read) of MMA. He was critical of the timing of the December 4, 2005, MMA board meeting. Mr. Pam explained that he has known President Gurnon and Captain Hansen for over 14 years. He compared the dismissals of President Gurnon and President Daniel Golden of Boston University and concluded that President Gurnon was wrongly dismissed. He told the Board that members of the Legislature and people from all over the world have been notified of the travesty of justice that has taken place at MMA. He urged the BHE to discuss with the Governor replacing the members of the MMA board, particularly those whose terms had expired. Mr. Pam also called for the reinstatement of Captain Hansen.

Karen White, President of the MMA Parent's Association, asked the Board not to approve the MMA action to dismiss President Gurnon. She reported that the MMA Parent's Association is involved in an email campaign to contact state legislators to make them aware of the current state of affairs at the Academy in an effort to reinstate President Gurnon and Vice President Allen Hansen. Ms. White reported that the MMA Parent's Association is proud of the Academy's cadets, who have the highest SAT averages, graduation and retention rates of all of the Commonwealth's state colleges. She thanked President Gurnon for his efforts in promoting

an environment that required the entire MMA family to live up to the Academy's core values of duty, honor and discipline.

Ms. Kathleen Kelley asked Ms. White if the MMA Presidential Search Committee included a member of the MMA Parent's Association. Ms. White answered that she and Wendie Howland attended a Search Committee meeting to meet the candidates but had no official role.

Chair Tocco announced that the Board's decision will be the beginning of the process to repair the institution and to give guidance and clarity to its students. He reiterated that with the BHE action, one phase ends and another begins. Chair Tocco pledged his commitment to meet with the MMA board regardless of the forthcoming decision of the Board.

Board member Karl White noted that there is "no clear winner" as a result of this vote. He said he understood the MMA board's legal position in being able to fire the president and that he also appreciated the comments from President Gurnon's admirers. He viewed the allegations of the MMA board meeting on November 15, 2005, as very serious, but he was clear that he still did not know all of the facts concerning that meeting and the entire episode. Mr. White stated that he found the situation very troubling in making a decision today. He vowed to work with the MMA Board to correct its problems.

Ms. Kathleen Kelley voiced her concern that it was unfortunate that this issue had not been resolved at the local level. She suggested that there should be procedures for addressing concerns about campus presidents' actions and that the president should also have an opportunity to answer any charges leveled against him or her. She cited the importance of justice and declared that she was deeply concerned because justice had not been afforded to President Gurnon.

Chair Tocco introduced the following motion, which was seconded but did not receive the necessary votes to pass.

**BHE 06-10 APPROVAL OF THE REMOVAL OF ADMIRAL RICHARD G. GURNON**

**MOVED:** In accordance with the provision of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 15A, Section 21, the Board of Higher Education approves the removal of Admiral Richard G. Gurnon as President of Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 21

**Contact:** Joseph Sullivan, General Counsel

Chair Tocco explained that the BHE had the authority to accept or reject the MMA decision to fire President Gurnon, but that the vote just taken did not correct a second vote of the MMA board of trustees which had striped President Gurnon of his powers. Therefore, he introduced the following motion that was seconded and unanimously approved.

**BHE 06-11 APPROVAL TO RESCIND THE MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY VOTE TO REMOKE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ADMIRAL RICHARD G. GURNON**

**MOVED:** That the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education requests that the Massachusetts Maritime Academy board of trustees rescind its vote to revoke the delegation of presidential powers and authority of Admiral Richard Gurnon

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 21  
**Contact** Joseph Sullivan, General Counsel

Chair Tocco said it was important to move forward in a positive way, and he offered the Board's assistance in correcting problems at MMA.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

**SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS (BHE 06-10 [o-r])  
MASSACHUSETTS STATE AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

**AN AMENDED REPORT FROM  
THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**DECEMBER 15, 2005**

**Introduction**

The quality of Massachusetts public state and community colleges is tied directly to the quality of the leadership provided by campus presidents. Public college presidents must be committed to the values of the academy and the education of their students, as well as to the mission and purposes of public higher education, including the economic, workforce and social needs of the community and the Commonwealth. The economic health of the Commonwealth is directly tied to the quality of education at our public institutions. Eighty-five percent of students who graduate from Massachusetts public colleges remain in the Commonwealth to work and raise families. The Commonwealth's ability to attract and retain the very best presidents at our institutions depends, in large part, on the ability of campus boards of trustees to offer competitive compensation packages.

**Background**

For the past three years the majority of state and community college presidents have not taken salary increases out of respect for their employees whose contracts had not been funded and concern for campus budgets that had been dramatically reduced. As a result, their salaries are no longer competitive with chief executive salaries at peer institutions. If Massachusetts is to retain talented presidential leaders, we must correct this situation.

This summer the inevitable happened. The president of one of our largest community colleges resigned to accept another presidency. During her ten years as president, enrollment at her institution doubled, \$7 million was raised to support the College - a particular notable achievement at a public community college - and the reputation of the College received national attention. The president's new salary will be 66% higher than her current salary. Her current salary was only slightly higher than the salary necessary earlier this year to recruit a new community college president, with no experience as a chief executive officer, to one of our smaller institutions.

In August 2004, the Board of Higher Education (BHE) received a report from the state college and community college trustee councils. The report provided a comparative analysis of presidential salaries using a national database of higher education administrators at similar institutions and served as the basis for a six-month follow-up study by a BHE Task Force on Presidential Compensation. The Task Force was charged with the responsibility for collecting additional data on presidential salary compensation issues and developing a process for determining salary changes. The Task Force report was presented to the Board of Higher Education at its April 2005 meeting, and guidelines were approved for a process to be used in determining presidential salary increases.

[At the September, 2005 BHE meeting, Board members approved salary increases for 14 presidents. At the December meeting you will be asked to approve increases for two community college presidents and two state college presidents.](#)

## **Overview of 2005 Guidelines on State and Community College Presidential Compensation**

The Board of Higher Education Compensation Guidelines for State and Community College Presidents were developed pursuant to Chapter 15A 9(q) that requires the Board of Higher Education to “approve and fix the compensation of the chief executive officer of each institution in the state college system and the community college system.” The Guidelines, approved in April 2005, state that presidential compensation should be based on the professional experience of the president, institutional size, complexity, and particular challenges, and a written performance evaluation conducted by the campus Board of Trustees. The evaluation should document the president’s accomplishment of previously approved goals and objectives, including the institution’s performance as measured by the Board of Higher Education performance measurement system.

Immediately following the Board’s approval of the Guidelines, chairs of the state and community college boards of trustees were informed of the process for requesting a salary increase for their presidents. Throughout July, August and into September, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education Stephen Tocco and Chancellor Judith Gill met with each campus board chair who had submitted a request for a salary increase and the campus president. The meetings were informative: campus initiatives were discussed, successes were highlighted, problems were disclosed and challenges were identified.

The BHE Executive Committee, comprising the Chair of the Board and the chairs of the Board’s two standing committees, met during the summer to consider the campus recommendations. In its deliberations, the Committee was guided by the model used by the Executive Office in the development of the Governor’s Executive Management Pay Scale.

### **Basis for Executive Committee Recommendations**

The Executive Committee based its salary recommendations included in this report (BHE-06-10 [o-r]) on three calculations:

**A calculation of an inflationary factor for each president.** The inflation factor was based on the cost-of-living adjustment published by the American Institute for Economic Research. Presidents whose last increases were in 2001 received an inflation percentage increase of 9.1%; those whose last increases were in 2002 received a 7.4% increase, and those whose last increases were in 2003 received a 5% increase. The average inflationary adjustment was 7.4%, an average increase of \$10,400.

**A calculation, applied after the inflationary adjustment, to adjust for salary inequities.** In the past, the size and complexity of an institution, the years and types of experience of an incoming president, and the challenges the new president would face at a particular institution were never adequately and systematically factored into compensation packages offered to new presidents or the salary increases of current presidents. As a result, salary inequities exist across the system.

To address these inequities, the Executive Committee factored in an equity adjustment calculation, based upon the salary study conducted by Sibson Associates as well as the additional analysis of salary compensation data collected by the Task Force on Presidential Compensation. The equity adjustment will be distributed equally over the next two years.

**A calculation of a percentage increase for merit.** The Executive Committee determined that a maximum 6% merit increase would be made available for each president. Because the president's performance is a matter of statutory concern for both the Board of Higher Education and each campus board of trustees, the 6% was divided equally between the two Boards, each with the ability to award a maximum of a 3% merit increase. Each president could receive a merit increase of 0-3% as a result of the president's accomplishments in meeting board of trustee goals and objectives, as well as a 0-3% merit increase based upon the BHE's assessment of the president's performance on BHE-related initiatives and concerns, such as serving on BHE task forces, success in achieving BHE performance objectives, responsiveness to BHE requests and initiatives, (e.g., efforts toward regionalization and strategic capital planning). The average performance merit increase was 5% (\$7,520).

### **Going Forward**

During the past year, members of boards of trustees, the Board of Higher Education and BHE staff have invested great time and effort to develop a rigorous, rational, performance-based, systematic approach to determining appropriate salary levels for the presidents of the state and community colleges. This was time well spent. The ability to award competitive salaries is critical if public higher education in Massachusetts is successfully to recruit and retain high quality leaders for our campuses.

To that end, the Executive Committee is recommending to the full Board of Higher Education that a new policy on presidential compensation be adopted. This policy would authorize campus boards of trustees to distribute an annual inflationary adjustment, calculated each spring by the Board of Higher Education. The boards of trustees will continue to be required to conduct annual performance reviews that will be forwarded to the Board of Higher Education along with the justification for the increase.

Every other year the boards of trustees may request, in addition to the salary adjustment, a merit adjustment based upon the achievement of measurable objectives.

### **New Salary Increase Recommendations**

The same BHE guidelines that were to approve salary increases for the 14 presidents in September, were used in the calculation of the salary increases for Presidents William Messner (Holyoke Community College) Charles Wall (Massasoit Community College), Mary Grant (Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts) and Vicky Carwein (President of Westfield State College). The guidelines require that salary increases will be based upon cost-of-living adjustments, equity adjustments (based upon years of service as a president and unusual/significant institutional challenges facing the president), and performance as evaluated by the board of trustees.

The following chart identifies the salaries approved by the Board of Higher Education for 14 presidents and the recommended salary increases for Presidents Messner, Wall, Grant, and Carwein.

		<b>DRAFT BHE Recommendation</b>					<b>Board of Trustees Recommendation</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>FTE Enrollment</b> <sup>/1</sup>	<b># Yrs as President</b> <sup>/2</sup>	<b>Current Base Salary</b>	<b>Total Base Salary % vs Current</b>		<b>Total Base Salary</b>	<b>% vs Current</b>
Berkshire	<i>Acting president</i>	1,372		N/A	N/A		-	
Bristol	Sbrega	4,062	5	133,100	154,980	16%	168,588	27%
Bunker Hill	Fifield	4,729	13	156,921	180,261	15%	188,000	20%
Cape Cod	Schatzberg	2,419	7	125,948	146,655	16%	153,334	22%
Greenfield	Pura	1,415	4	124,910	144,000	15%	144,000	15%
Holyoke	Messner	4,225	18	158,000	176,800	12%	178,000	13%
MassBay	Joseph	3,587	0	140,000	<i>New hire</i>		-	
Massasoit	Wall	4,102	9	132,500	145,000	9%	145,000	9%
Middlesex	Cowan	5,001	15	165,426	187,500	13%	188,000	14%
Mt Wachusett	Asquino	2,411	19	164,222	183,750	12%	188,000	14%
North Shore	Burton	4,054	5	127,408	150,164	18%	165,000	30%
Northern Essex	Hartleb	3,713	9	135,000	161,136	19%	173,000	28%
Quinsigamond	<i>Acting president</i>	4,217			N/A		-	
Roxbury	Gomes	1,552	2	135,000	147,420	9%	150,000	11%
STCC	Rubenzahl	4,114	9	155,000	<i>President not accepting increase</i>		-	
Bridgewater	Mohler-Faria	7,628	3	158,000	188,590	19%	204,000	29%
Fitchburg	Antonucci	3,375	11	165,000	186,750	13%	195,000	18%
Framingham	Heineman	4,374	6	186,000	<i>Retiring President</i>		-	
MassArt	Sloan	1,642	18	175,000	194,775	11%	239,000	37%
MCLA	Grant	1,714	3	140,000	166,650	19%	170,000	21%
Mass Maritime	Gurnon	1,094		140,000	<i>New hire</i>		-	
Salem	Harrington	6,823	14	161,195	192,617	19%	195,000	21%
Westfield <sup>/3</sup>	Carwein	4,266	10	163,000	178,500	10%	185,110	14%
Worcester	Ashley	4,424	3	156,001	170,000	9%	176,250	13%

**Footnotes**

/1 Annual unduplicated credit FTE as of FY 2004

/2 Years of experience as college president as reported on Aug 2004 memo, Chancellor to Board

/3 Average housing allowance for College Presidents is \$18k; President Carwein receives \$24k.

**BHE 06-10o**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education fixes the salary of Dr. William Messner, President, Holyoke Community College, at \$176,800.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9(q)  
**Contact:** Judith I. Gill, Chancellor

**BHE 06-10p**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education fixes the salary of Dr. Charles Wall, President, Massasoit Community College, at \$145,000.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9(q)  
**Contact:** Judith I. Gill, Chancellor

**BHE 06-10q**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education fixes the salary of Dr. Mary Grant, President, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, at \$166,600.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9(q)  
**Contact:** Judith I. Gill, Chancellor

**BHE 06-10r**

**MOVED:** The Board of Higher Education fixes the salary of Dr. Vicky Carwein, President, Westfield State College, at \$178,500.

**Authority:** Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 15A, Section 9(q)  
**Contact:** Judith I. Gill, Chancellor

## Board of Higher Education Compensation Guidelines for State and Community College Presidents

The guidelines were developed pursuant to Chap. 15A 9(q) and two votes by the Board of Higher Education. Chap. 15A 9(q) requires the Board of Higher Education to “approve and fix the compensation of the chief executive officer of each institution in the state college system and the community college system.”

The first BHE vote (03-06 in December 2002) stated that “no increase or decrease in compensation shall be paid to a college president until the Board of Higher Education has approved” the amount submitted to the Board by the respective campus Board of Trustees. The background to the vote also states: “The Board of Higher Education intends to work with campus presidents and boards of trustees to develop a statewide comprehensive compensation system that is coherent and consistent. Based upon national standards, this system will reward accountability and performance and enhance public confidence.”

The second BHE vote (04-24 in August 2004) accepted the state and community college presidential compensation studies and established a Board Task Force on Presidential Compensation. The vote directed the Task Force to review the Sibson *Presidential Total Compensation* study and “all other issues related to presidential compensation and process, including but not limited to the cost of living, housing, and guidelines for performance.” The Board directed the Task Force to report its findings and recommendations to the Board.

The findings and recommendations are presented below.

### I. Presidential Compensation should be based upon the following:

- A. Executive skills, competencies, experience and institutional challenges
- B. Presidential performance as indicated in an annual written evaluation by the board of trustees. The president’s performance should be based upon measurable goals that should be based but are not limited to the following:

Institutional evaluation on the Board of Higher Education performance indicators and achievement of goals (see Appendix A)

Institutional leadership and management skills:

- Fiscal management and budgeting
- General management and planning
- Decision-making and problem-solving

Personal attributes, including trust and integrity

Fundraising

Internal relationships/campus climate

External relationships/leadership in the community

- C. Alignment with recruitment market

## **II. Recommendations:**

- A. The responsibilities of the Board of Higher Education Executive Committee will include those related to state college and community college presidential compensation.
- B. Each institutional board of trustees will “set” a compensation package for its president and submit this package to the Board of Higher Education, which has the statutory authority to “approve and fix” compensation.
- C. The Board of Higher Education Task Force on Presidential Compensation, working in collaboration with the trustees’ associations, will hire a compensation consultant to conduct a study on presidential compensation components that will be considered by the Board of Higher Education. This study will assess and recommend a compensation system for presidents that shall include replacements for the housing allowance (e.g., deferred compensation and annuities) and consider alternative compensation components, such as bonuses. A report will be issued within six months.
- D. A market analysis of presidential compensation will be conducted biennially for the presidents at the state and community colleges in the high-cost Northeast states and of presidential compensation at public liberal arts colleges and colleges of art and maritime academies.
- E. The Board of Higher Education will regularly conduct a seminar on presidential evaluation and compensation for institutional boards of trustees.

## **III. Compensation Review Process**

- A. Board of Trustees’ Responsibilities:
  - 1. Boards of trustees will forward completed evaluations, including a two-page executive summary, and a compensation submittal to the Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education.
  - 2. The board of trustees shall justify its compensation submittal based on professional experience of the president, institutional challenges and a performance evaluation of the president.
- B. Board of Higher Education Responsibilities:
  - 1. The process of the BHE review will be as expeditious as possible and, except in unusual circumstances, completed within 60 days. Within 14 days of receiving the trustees’ submittal, the Chancellor will notify the chair of the board of trustees that:
    - a. the submittal will be sent to the BHE Executive Committee;
    - b. the submittal is not consistent with the BHE guidelines; or
    - c. the Chair of the BHE Executive Committee will be requesting a meeting with the Chair and the President; or,
  - 2. Upon determination that the board of trustees’ compensation submittal is complete and is consistent with the BHE compensation guidelines, the Chancellor will forward this submittal to the Chair of the Board of Higher Education, who also serves as the Chair of the Executive Committee.

3. Upon review of the trustees' evaluation, the BHE Chair may forward the evaluation to the Executive Committee members or may elect to request a meeting of the Chancellor, the President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees.
4. The BHE Executive Committee and the Chancellor will meet to discuss the submittal made by the board of trustees. The recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education will be based upon the board of trustees' justification for the new compensation package and the reasonableness of the request.
5. The Chancellor shall forward the recommendation of the Executive Committee to the full Board of Higher Education for consideration and formal action.
6. In six months, and upon receipt of the study on presidential compensation components referred to in II C above, the Board of Higher Education shall review the process as defined in these guidelines and shall make a determination whether to delegate the Board's authority to approve and fix the compensation of the chief executive officer to the Chancellor and the Executive Committee.

## **Appendix A: Segmental Goals**

In February 2005, the Board of Higher Education approved a list of segmental goals for the state and community colleges. As a part of the evaluation received by the Board of Higher Education, the board of trustees must comment on the president's efforts and achievements in each area. The segmental goals are listed below.

### **Massachusetts State College Goals**

#### *Enhancing Academic Programs*

The state colleges will embark on a multi-year effort to strengthen their ability to plan, develop and implement proficiency standards in teacher education/preparation programs and to advance excellence in K-12 curriculum frameworks.

The state colleges will expand technology opportunities in the classroom and implement the multi-campus wireless laptop initiative. The state colleges will continue to enhance teaching, learning, and professional development programs. They will work intensively and cooperatively with the Board of Higher Education to develop and implement the Public Higher Education Nursing Initiative with particular focus on addressing the need for additional nursing faculty.

#### *Increasing Graduation Rates*

The state colleges will complete a comprehensive analysis of effective and affordable best practices in the areas of retention and advising. In consultation with the Board of Higher Education, the colleges will begin to execute an implementation of identified best practices designed to increase the rate of state college students achieving a bachelor's degree within a six-year period.

#### *Maximizing Affordability*

The colleges will continue to deliver a high-quality education in the most efficient manner possible. The colleges will work closely with the Board of Higher Education, the Governor and the General Court to increase state appropriations to student financial aid and to close the budget gap identified through formula funding.

#### *Fostering Collaboration*

The state colleges will build on the impressive array of collaborative partnerships forged or enhanced over the past several years with all segments of public higher education, PreK-12 districts and individual schools, regional and statewide business entities and organizations and municipalities and state agencies. They will partner with the community colleges to increase the number of transfer applications of community college graduates to the state colleges.

#### *Strengthening Fundraising Efforts*

The state colleges will raise the public profile of individual campus fundraising efforts to attract additional private support for the public mission of the colleges.

## **Massachusetts Community College Goals**

### *Expanding Workforce Development*

The community colleges will analyze job growth data and employment trends as well as regional skill needs and will work collaboratively with other segments of public higher education, Workforce Investment Boards, and economic development councils.

The campuses will address demonstrated critical shortages in nursing and allied health professions by working with the Board of Higher Education and health care organizations. The community colleges will work cooperatively with other public higher education institutions in their regions to deliver programs and courses efficiently.

### *Making Affordability*

A priority goal of the community colleges will be to meet the direct costs of education for students with financial need, especially first-generation students who are seeking higher education.

### *Enhancing Student Access*

A commitment to student success is and will continue to be the most important issue for community colleges. The Massachusetts community colleges have been tracing cohorts of first-time full- and part-time degree- or certificate-seeking students. These data will be further analyzed and used to identify strategies to develop measures which would enhance future student success.

### *Strengthening Fundraising Efforts*

The Massachusetts community colleges will continue to set a high fundraising standard. The colleges will build and cultivate an active alumni database. Additional campus-based mechanisms will be instituted to build scholarship endowment.

### *Expanding Collaborations*

The community colleges will explore additional opportunities for collaboration and articulation with four-year public higher education institutions, community-based organizations, not-for-profits and propriety schools, and expand relationships with the Adult Basic Education program providers and K-12 school districts to strengthen the transition into post-secondary education.

The evaluation of the president's achievement on segmental goals will be increasingly linked to an evaluation of the president's achievement on institutional goals as proposed in the April 2005 Report of the Senate Task Force on Public Higher Education, *Investing in Our Future*. The report reads (pp. 40-41):

"We recommend ... that the Board of Higher Education (on behalf the state and community colleges) ... as part of the annual performance measurement process, ask each campus to specify the key mission-related activities it will pursue to advance the goals outlined by the Task Force, to identify a subset of performance measurements related to those activities, and to knit these together into an assessment of its impact."

"The assessments should address the following core goals of the Task Force:  
Understanding and responding to the Commonwealth's workforce needs (ranging from identified "gaps" in specific vocations or industries to broader needs for a creative, adaptable citizenry).  
Strengthening innovation at all stages, from the creation of new knowledge to its application to specific products and processes to its expression in the marketplace.  
Broadening the opportunities for Massachusetts citizens to pursue their educational goals and participate in the emerging economy.  
Forming collaborations and partnerships in management and academic programming that increase efficiency in our public higher education system."

The goals stated in *Investing in Our Future* mirror closely the segmental goals. The Senate goals are reflected in several of the performance indicators that will be used in presidential evaluations, as outlined in Section I of this document. The institutional goals identified for each campus are a further way of incorporating the Senate Task Force goals into the evaluation system.

The attainment of all of these goals is affected by the progress toward full funding of the formula-based funding gap for the institutions and the system.

## Appendix B: Summary of Base Salary Ranges

### Presidential Base Salary Ranges in High-Cost Northeast States \* (in Millions)

Community College Presidents	Base Salary Range
Operating Budget: \$19-34	\$128 – \$156
Operating Budget: \$35-100	\$155 – \$188
State College Presidents	Base Salary Range
Operating Budget: \$19-54	\$151 – \$213
Operating Budget: \$55-100	\$169 – \$239
Public Liberal Arts College Presidents	Base Salary Range
All Institutions	\$150 – \$212 <sup>1</sup>

### Presidential Salaries in Massachusetts by Operating Budget

Community Colleges					
\$19 – 34 Million Operating Budget	President's Base Salary **	Years as President of an Institution	\$35 – 100 Million Operating Budget	President's Base Salary **	Years as President of an Institution
Berkshire	\$130,000	4	Bristol	\$133,000	5
Cape Cod	\$126,000	7	Bunker Hill	\$157,000	13
Greenfield	\$121,000	4	Holyoke	\$158,000	18
Mass Bay	\$140,000	2 mos	Massasoit	\$133,000	9
Roxbury	\$135,000	2	Middlesex	\$161,000	15
			Mount Wachusett	\$164,000	19
			Northern Essex	\$135,000	9
			North Shore	\$127,000	5
			Quinsigamond	\$140,000	10
			STCC	\$155,000	9

\$19 – 54 Million Operating Budget	President's Base Salary **	Years as President of an Institution	\$55 – 100 Million Operating Budget	President's Base Salary **	Years as President of an Institution
Fitchburg	\$165,000	11 <sup>2</sup>	Bridgewater	\$158,000	3
Framingham	\$168,000	6	Salem	\$162,000	14
Westfield	\$163,000	10 <sup>3</sup>			
Worcester	\$156,000	3			

\* The salary ranges are based on the CUPA (College and University Personnel Association) Administrative Compensation Survey for 2004. The high-cost Northeast states are: Connecticut, Delaware, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Maine, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island.

\*\* The presidential base salaries should reflect years of experience. However, no salary increases have been awarded to state or community college presidents since December 2002. Because of the budget constraints, some presidents did not accept salary increases that were approved in 2001.

<sup>1</sup> The base salary for the President of Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts is \$140,000. She has been a president for three years.

<sup>2</sup> DOE Commissioner 1992-1998, President of Harcourt 1998-2001.

<sup>3</sup> 9 years as Chancellor of the University of Washington Tacoma.

## Appendix C: Summary of Additional Compensation in New England and High-Cost Northeast States

	Community Colleges	State Colleges
<b>Connecticut</b>	30% receive bonuses; all receive car allowance.	65% reported \$10,000 in deferred compensation; 65% received bonuses of approximately \$13,000; all receive car.
<b>Maine</b>	Presidents receive \$4,800 in housing allowance, automobile and can choose between retirement system (31%) or TIAA-CREF (13%).	House provided; \$5,000 in deferred compensation; car.
<b>Maryland</b>	50% received deferred or supplemental retirement benefits – ranging from 7% to 20% of base salary. 25% reported receiving car allowance.	Presidents receive house or housing allowance (\$25,000).
<b>Massachusetts</b>	All presidents receive a housing allowance – 90% receive \$18,000; they can choose between the state retirement system or an optional retirement plan (the state contributes 4.3% of salary to ORP for investments); all receive a car or allowance.	75% of the presidents receive a housing allowance; 25% (or 2) have had the housing allowance rolled into their base salary; of the presidents receiving a housing allowance, all but one president receives an allowance of \$18,000. Presidents can choose between the state retirement system and the optional retirement plan (see explanation under Community Colleges); all receive a car or allowance.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	Car allowance.	Declined to respond.
<b>New Jersey</b>	75% receive housing allowance ranging from \$8,000 to \$24,000; 40% receive deferred or supplemental retirement benefits; retirement benefits range from 4 to 18%; 30% receive bonuses; all receive car or auto allowance.	Presidents receive house or housing allowance (\$42,000); retirement benefits equal 8% of base salary.
<b>New York</b>	50% receive house (7) or housing allowance ranging (10) from \$7,000 to \$36,000 (NYC); 50% receive supplemental or deferred annuity ranging from \$4,000 to \$18,000; in addition to housing, 40% receive deferred compensation or supplemental annuities; all receive car and additional life insurance.	Declined to respond.
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	One president receives housing allowance (\$30,000); 60% received retirement benefits greater than 10%; 30% receive deferred compensation ranging from 10-15%; all receive car or car allowance.	All presidents receive house; retirement benefits equal 9.29% of base salary.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	House is provided to president; \$10,000 in deferred compensation and car.	President receives house and \$17,000 in deferred compensation
<b>Vermont</b>	President receives \$8,000 in housing allowance, 26% of base salary in retirement, and car.	President receives house and car.