

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

January 16, 2018
10:00 a.m.

One Ashburton Place, 21st Floor
Conference Room 1
Boston, Massachusetts

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present: Committee Chair Nancy Hoffman; Sheila Harrity, Vice Chair; Board Chair Chris Gabrieli; Fernando Reimers; Secretary of Education James Peyser; Student Board Member Danielle Dupuis.

Commissioner Carlos Santiago, non-voting member.

Committee Members Absent: Henry Thomas

Department Staff Present: Keith Connors; Kate Flanagan; Patricia Marshall; Clantha McCurdy; Constantia Papanikolaou; Elena Quiroz-Livanis; Ashley Wisneski

I. CALL TO ORDER

AAC Chair Nancy Hoffman called the meeting to order at 10:09 a.m.

II. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

On a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the December 5, 2017 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee were unanimously approved.

III. REMARKS

Chair Hoffman welcomed all in attendance and noted the meeting would begin with presentations followed by motions, and not the other way around as usual, to ensure time for discussion. All board members were in agreement. Chair Hoffman invited Commissioner Santiago to share his remarks before she turned the meeting over to Deputy Commissioner Marshall. Commissioner Santiago thanked his staff for their work on the revised program approval process. He also noted that, with regard to that agenda item, today's task would be to decide on the next steps in the revision of the program approval process.

Deputy Commissioner Marshall began her remarks by stating that today the board will be asked to accept the *Designing Math Pathways* report and that this marks an important milestone in the Department's work to reduce remediation. She added that the report represents the culmination of the work of the Math Pathways Subcommittee, which was charged with ensuring that students take the appropriate math for their major. She congratulated Elena Quiroz-Livanis on spearheading this important work and thanked campus representatives who generously offered their time and expertise as members of the subcommittee. She also acknowledged the Charles

A. Dana Center at the University of Texas Austin as an important partner in the development of the report. Finally, Deputy Commissioner Marshall brought to committee members' attention two conferences the Department will sponsor in the Spring: the 7th Annual AMCOA (Advancing a Massachusetts Culture of Assessment) Conference on April 20th; and the annual Civic Learning and Engagement Conference on May 29th.

IV. PRESENTATION

List of Documents Used

AAC Meeting PowerPoint, Jan. 12, 2018

AAC Meeting Handout, "Status Update on Program Review Revision"

AAC Meeting Handout, "Summary of Public Comment by Who Responded"

AAC Meeting Handout, "Summary of Public Comment Table"

- Revised Program Approval Process for Public Institutions

Dr. Marshall began the presentation by directing members' attention to a PowerPoint presentation based on the three primary documents members had before them including: 1) Status Update on Program Review Revision, 2) Summary of Public Comment by who responded and 3) Summary of Public Comment Table. Dr. Marshall invited additions to the summary table. Board Chair Gabrieli replied by noting the program approval process was an important element for ensuring the public's interest is well served by a higher education system well connected to workforce development. All proposed campus programs, he said, should also align with the campus strategic plan and with the state's higher education goals. He encouraged Commissioner Santiago and the campuses to view the proposed, revised program approval process positively for saving campuses and DHE time and unnecessary work since the Board would approve applications earlier in the process. By example, Board Chair Gabrieli referenced the recent UMass Dartmouth application. In that instance, Board members felt uncomfortable giving their approval but felt compelled to do so because of the time UMass invested in arriving at that point. Board Chair Gabrieli also stressed the importance of new programs being aligned to university strategic plans and not to particular campus department needs.

Chair Hoffman thanked Board Member Gabrieli for his remarks and encouraged Dr. Marshall to present all the slides before fielding more questions.

Secretary Peyser commented on the slide which highlighted one of five campus concerns regarding the revised program approval recommendations. The concern presented on the slide was the possible contradiction of MGL Chapter 15A, Section 9 and MGL 75, Section 2 with the proposed revisions. The campuses stated that the proposed process would result in their local Board of Trustees being displaced from preliminary review. Secretary Peyser reminded committee members that the BHE already has statutory authority for program approval. Today's meeting is about refining the Board's role to elevate it from assessing program quality to assessing system integration and need.

Dr. Marshall launched into the presentation by summarizing the feedback received during the public comment period where all three education segments (Community College, State University, UMass) replied. One-third of the community colleges and all of the 4-year institutions responded. The community colleges responded positively saying they thought the revisions: 1) provided greater clarity to the process, 2) gave more follow-up detail, 3) helped expedite program approval and 4) added credibility with the increased focus on employer external review. Dr. Marshall summarized the concerns of the 4-year institutions into five distinct areas that

required further attention: 1) statutory contradiction and role of local boards, 2) absence of evaluation criteria, 3) failure to solicit campus input, 4) lack of alignment with the unique role of UMass as a research institution, and 5) perceived inefficiency of the process.

Board Chair Chris Gabrieli responded to the last concern regarding the perceived inefficiency of the process, by stating that he believes the real question the campuses should be asking is whether the process is fair and how the process benefits them. He wondered if the campuses mistakenly thought the process would add extra work when the purpose of the revisions is to prevent application denials after a campus is too far along in the process.

Chair Hoffman commented on UMass' concern regarding its unique role as a research institution being lost/forgotten in the process and suggested the Board consider changing the recommended next steps from "a comprehensive review of procedures at peer research institution" to "prioritizing best practices where they exist." Board members seemed receptive to this suggestion. Secretary Peyser added that other states do not impose the same oversight on their universities so he understood UMass' concerns. He felt, however, that UMass did not fully comprehend that the new revisions would not interfere with their unique status.

Board Member Reimers stated that he believed the new process would save program applicants from pursuing a dead-end path. Vice-Chair Harrity asked what outcomes the revised program approval committee expected to see at this early stage. Dr. Marshall responded, stating that the first step would be to revise the letter of intent (LOI) template to elicit clearer articulation from institutions on how a proposed program aligns to campus and state strategic plans. Chair Hoffman agreed. Board Member Dupuis complimented the planned timeline.

Board Chair Gabrieli observed the need to acknowledge that the benefits of the new approach might not immediately be obvious to everyone and that it might take a mutual working group to provide clarity around the process. He stated that each campus also needs to review its strategic plan to make sure new programs support it. Campus leadership might need to have conversations with faculty to prevent unnecessary programs from being promoted. He thought the development of clear documents (such as the LOI) will be the right tools to encourage these important conversations.

Chair Hoffman added that she believed important conversations would arise from the dialogue such as, "Are certain programs needed?"

As a solution to concerns related to the perceived inefficiency of the proposed process, Board Chair Gabrieli suggested the state might want to hold stakeholder meetings to gain a better understanding of the revised process and to ensure that campuses realize its value and the Board's desire for their success. These meetings should acknowledge the initial increased burden for campuses while promoting how the process will actually lessen the burden over time. Board Chair Gabrieli encouraged Commissioner Santiago to make sure campus 5-year strategic plans align with this vision and the new process. Board Member Fernando agreed noting that he saw the recommended changes as ones that support students while being fiscally accountable.

Board Chair Gabrieli added that the revisions, at their heart, are not about program approval but about strategic planning. The Board should not be in the business of determining program quality but rather the value of the programs to the entire system.

Chair Hoffman, in acknowledgement of the Board Chair's comments, emphasized the importance that members determine the most favorable time for the Board's involvement in the program approval process, especially one that supports the Board's goals.

Following on the Chair's comments, Secretary Peyser added that campuses should be prepared for changes to the process and that the Board should not falter from the current timeline. The members concurred and Chair Hoffman emphasized the need to provide the campuses very clear templates and instructions to elicit reliable feedback. Commissioner Santiago made known the DHE is in conversation with the campuses on the alignment of their strategic plans to the Performance Measurement System and that the system is evolving.

Overall, the Board welcomed the articulated "potential next steps" outlined in the slides for addressing each of the five concerns. The only instance where the Board suggested a different tactic was in regards to the fourth concern (the unique role of UMass). In that instance, the Board recommended the DHE consider common best practice approaches.

V. MOTIONS

List of Documents Used

AAC Meeting PowerPoint, Jan. 12, 2018

AAC Motions 18-17 through 18-19 new program motions

A. AAC 18-16 Acceptance of the Final Report of the Math Pathways Subcommittee

Chief of Staff and Director of Academic Policy and Student Success, Elena Quiroz-Livanis presented the report findings. Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis began her presentation by thanking the AAC for their feedback during the June 2017 meeting when she initially shared the recommendations of the Math Pathways Subcommittee. She thanked members of the Subcommittee, particularly the co-chairs, Linda Dart-Kathios and Maura Murray. She also thanked the team at the Charles A. Dana Center, who have partnered with the Department around math pathways.

The Math Pathways subcommittee included mathematics faculty representatives from the community colleges, state universities, University of Massachusetts, and high schools, as well as provosts representing both two- and four-year institutions, a transfer representative, and a staff member from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Subcommittee was charged with exploring the benefits and implications of multiple math pathways and developing recommendations for increasing success in mathematics that will: ensure students take the appropriate math for their major; increase alignment between college-level and developmental mathematics across the three segments of public higher education to promote on-time completion; and increase transferability of math courses and applicability across the three segments of public higher education.

The subcommittee developed five major recommendations:

1. In an effort to ensure students complete the right mathematics course for their major, Massachusetts institutions of public higher education should develop at least four math pathways: Calculus, Elementary Education, Quantitative Reasoning, and Statistics.
2. MassTransfer Associate-to-Bachelor (A2B) mapped pathways disciplines should identify the appropriate default or recommended mathematics for their major.

3. Students who require remediation should have the opportunity to complete college-level mathematics course within one year of enrollment, preferably within a co-requisite model.
4. The DHE should develop a course completion indicator (“flag”) for all courses that satisfy Quantitative Reasoning requirements. This will improve the DHE’s data collection and the ability to track student progress.
5. The Department of Higher Education should work with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to ensure alignment between K-12 and postsecondary course expectations.

Secretary Peyser asked about the difference between quantitative reasoning (QR) and statistics. Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis responded by directing everyone to page 26 of the report. There, she highlighted the subcommittee developed a suggested course description and topics to be covered in a quantitative reasoning course taught by the math department. Secretary Peyser asked if students are required to take at least one math course and Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis stated they are required to meet the quantitative reasoning requirement.

Chair Hoffman asked about the number of math majors who take QR courses and Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis replied that the number of programs that would utilize the QR pathway is small.

Chair Hoffman invited Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis to share with the Committee the current status of the work. Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis shared that a Working Group had been created to advance the recommendations and there are five committees:

1. One focused on bring the co-requisite model to scale
2. One focused on the alignment between college algebra and calculus
3. One focused on courses that satisfy the quantitative reasoning requirement that are taught outside of the math department
4. One focused on aligning the mathematics courses for students in elementary education
5. One focused on mathematics alignment between K-12 and postsecondary

Board Member Reimers suggested that those who work on the elementary education pathway focus on developing a pathway focused on ensuring future educators are highly prepared, particularly mathematics teachers.

Student Member Dupuis asked how the math pathways work for the undeclared student. Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis responded by saying there is a lot of work happening on the campuses to ensure they identify a major as early as possible. Simultaneously, students rarely move from non-STEM to STEM programs, so they are generally advised to complete a statistics course.

Board Member Fernando Reimers departed at 11:03 a.m., due to a prior commitment.

Student Member Dupuis followed up by asking about multiple measures and Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis responded by stating that the Department has contracted with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute, a group conducting an independent evaluation of the campus GPA pilots. It is conceivable that different pathways might have different placement requirements. Chair Hoffman asked if the DHE has a plan for initiating similar work for English pathways and Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis responded that a group was already working on this issue as part of the co-requisite work and they were also looking at the use of GPA as an alternative placement measure.

Vice Chair Harranty commented on the change in education philosophy in the K-12 sphere from graduating students on time to making sure students were graduating college and career ready and how that philosophy plays into the need to get our K-12 teachers in the same room for the purpose of eliciting their feedback on the mass transfer pathways work. Mrs. Quiroz-Livanis pointed out the K-12 alignment subcommittee will come together for the very purpose of better understanding the needs of the different education sectors. Committee Chair Hoffman asked if committee members had any further questions or comments. Hearing none, Chair Hoffman called for a vote on the AAC 18-16. On a motion duly made and seconded, the following motion was passed unanimously by all committee members present:

AAC 18- 16 ACCEPTANCE OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TRANSFORMING DEVELOPMENTAL MATH EDUCATION - MATHEMATICS PATHWAYS SUBCOMMITTEE.

MOVED: The Board of Higher Education accepts the final report of the Math Pathways Subcommittee.

Authority: Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 15A, § 6 and 9

Contact: Elena Quiroz-Livanis, Chief of Staff and Director of Academic Policy and Student Success
Patricia A. Marshall, Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs and Student Success

**B. AAC 18-17 Framingham State University
Bachelor of Science in Child and Family Studies**

Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Student Success, Patricia Marshall, presented the program. The proposed Child and Family Studies major aligns closely with the Framingham State University (FSU) mission. It is expected to prepare students to become thoughtful and responsible citizens who participate in and serve as teachers and leaders in the profession of early education and care. It is intended that students will have the opportunity to foster positive developmental and learning experiences for young children and their families. It is expected that students will engage in active learning and in service work and that graduates of the proposed Child and Family Studies major will help meet the significant employment needs of the MetroWest region, and more broadly the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The proposed program is further intended to prepare students to work as early childhood educators to children from birth through age 8 in the Massachusetts mixed delivery system. This includes early intervention, private and public pre-school settings, family child care centers, Head Start, and out-of-school childcare settings. Students who complete this major will be eligible to apply for their infant, toddler, or preschool teaching certification from the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care; be prepared to assume leadership roles in the field as early childhood center directors, staff at state agencies; or to pursue graduate studies in related fields.

The reviewers found the proposed program to be closely aligned with FSU's mission. They noted that it had a well-conceptualized curriculum that will meet a significant, critical workforce need in Massachusetts. The review team found the faculty to be of high caliber, and the interdisciplinary scope of the major to enable students to be well-prepared for a highly interdisciplinary field. The reviewers recommended that FSU add a research-based,

'strengthening families' approach to the curriculum in addition to suggestions regarding language and culture for specific course adjustments. As well, non-credit seminars were suggested as a means of professional development opportunities in preparing for workforce demands. Framingham responded in appreciation and agreement with the external reviewers' recommendations and suggestions. Adjustments were made regarding the strengthening families approach and plans are underway to further embed knowledge of linguistic and cultural components within syllabi. Framingham had anticipated offering professional development sessions and plans are underway for these as well.

Staff thoroughly reviewed all documentation and recommends approval of the proposed Bachelor of Science in Child and Family Studies program.

Chair Hoffman opened the floor to discussion. Secretary Peyser spoke first, asking FSU if they already offered a bachelor degree in Child and Family Studies and, if they did, how it was different. FSU responded saying the current bachelor degree program provides licensure by DESE and the proposed program has its own core curriculum. The Chair inquired about the rationale for developing the program. FSU replied by highlighting the needs in greater Framingham necessitating well-trained and knowledgeable child and family care directors for the health of families. Further, FSU made sure to align the major to the Department of Early Education and Care's Quality Rating and Improvement (QRIS) standards. Secretary Peyser asked why the program didn't require student placements at childcare facilities, an inquiry/concern shared by other Board members including Chair Hoffman, to which FSU said most of the students have field experiences (*i.e.*, working at child care centers), aided by their on-campus childcare facility. Nonetheless, FSU appreciated the comment and said they would address this concern to make sure all students have field exposure. Next the Secretary asked about the curriculum components and how they help to teach candidates how to manage/develop adults. The Secretary also pointed out only one course focused on administration and leadership and wondered if just one course would be sufficient to prepare students for leadership roles. Representatives from FSU replied that management/leadership skills are embedded throughout the program. FSU assured that the program included a focus on the development of adults throughout, but especially in the administration course. The Secretary suggested FSU consider two curriculum tracks: one focused on child development and the other focused on adult development. Vice-Chair Harranty commented that nowhere in FSU's program description does it reference potential career salary. She made mention of this omission and acknowledged the field pays poorly. She also asked whether employees are looking for candidates with certificates or Bachelor's degrees. Secretary Peyser pointed out that EEC is currently reviewing the QRIS standards and that there is likely to be an increased focus on skills, not just credentialing. He also stated that there will not be a regulatory requirement for a Bachelor's degree.

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

AAC 18-17 APPLICATION FROM FRAMINGHAM STATE TO AWARD THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHILD AND FAMILY STUDIES

MOVED: The Board of Higher Education hereby approves the application of **Framingham State University** to award the **Bachelor of Science in Child and Family Studies**.

asked what kind of student NSCC expected to attract to the program. NSCC feels that they will attract students already taking social media classes as well as those aspiring to go into communications or media. NSCC added that their proposed program is intended to be a one-year certificate program and not a credential or license. Secretary Peyser asked if NSCC thought about a competency-based curriculum and NSCC responded saying they are considering all education models as they move forward, including hybrid, competency-based, etc. The Secretary then asked if NSCC thought about internships and field studies. NSCC replied that experiential learning is embedded in two of the courses included in the program.

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

AAC 18-11 APPLICATION FROM NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO AWARD A SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING CERTIFICATE

MOVED: The Board of Higher Education hereby approves the application of the **North Shore Community College** to award a **Social Media Marketing Certificate**.

Upon graduating the first class for these programs, North Shore Community College 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.

**D. AAC 18-19 University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Master of Science in Finance**

Deputy Commissioner Marshall presented the program. UMass Dartmouth expects that the proposed program will provide an innovative degree that serves the needs of students and represents affordable preparation for advancement in a field of high demand.

The intent of the proposed program is to provide students with the theoretical knowledge and practical skills necessary to be innovative, well informed, and experienced finance professionals. The proposed curriculum is based on financial theory and empirical methods that are employed by professionals practicing corporate finance, financial security valuation, financial modeling, portfolio management, financial services management, financial risk management, and corporate governance. UMass Dartmouth designed the program to meet student demand for integrated and experiential learning and developmental experiences that prepare them to be competitive, market-ready, and successful in a rapidly changing environment. UMass Dartmouth expects that graduates of the program will be eligible for jobs in banks, investment banking firms, pension funds, private equity and hedge funds, financial planning firms, mutual fund and investment organizations, corporations, insurance companies, health care organizations, real estate related companies and governmental and regulatory agencies as well as many other areas.

The External Reviewers made two recommendations. One, add a course on Ethics, Compliance, and Regulation, and an Internship/Practicum to be offered as an additional elective course. Two, it was recommended that a full-time tenure track position be added in order to adequately staff the new program without increasing the number of courses and preparations of the current faculty. In response to the first recommendations, UMass Dartmouth agreed and adjusted the proposal accordingly. Regarding the recommendation for additional faculty, UMass Dartmouth has committed to hiring a full-time lecturer after the proposed program is approved.

Staff thoroughly reviewed all documentation submitted by the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and external reviewers. Staff recommendation is for approval of the proposed Master of Science in Finance program.

Chair Hoffman opened the floor to questions and, seeing none, asked if UMD conducted labor market research to assess the need for the program in the region. UMD replied that they did and the data demonstrate the need for the program.

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

AAC 18-12 APPLICATION FROM UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH TO AWARD THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN FINANCE.

MOVED: The Board of Higher Education hereby approves the application of the **University of Massachusetts Dartmouth** to award the **Master of Science in Finance**.

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

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

The following consent agenda motion was brought forth, seconded and unanimously approved:

E. AAC 18-13 CONSENT AGENDA

MOVED: The Board of Higher Education approves the following motions on a consent agenda:

AAC 18-17 Framingham State University
Bachelor of Science in Child and Family Studies

AAC 18-18 North Shore Community College
Social Media Marketing Certificate

AAC 18-19 University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Master of Science in Finance

Authority: Article III, Section 6, By-Laws

Contact: Winifred M. Hagan, Ed.D., Associate 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 12:05 p.m.