

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

October 16, 2018
10:00 a.m.

One Ashburton Place, 14th Floor
DHE Large Conference Room
Boston, Massachusetts

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present: Committee Chair Nancy Hoffman; Fernando Reimers; Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau; Student Board Member Kush Patel; Community College Segmental Student Advisor Stephanie Teixeira (non-voting member); Commissioner Carlos Santiago (non-voting member).

Committee Members Absent: Vice Chair Sheila Harrity; Board Chair Chris Gabrieli;

Department Staff Present: Ignacio Chaparro, Keith Connors, Winifred Hagan, Patricia Marshall, Constantia Papanikolaou, Elena Quiroz-Livanis
Christine Williams

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Nancy Hoffman called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

II. Acceptance of Minutes

On a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes from the June 12, 2018 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee were unanimously approved.

III. Remarks

Committee Chair Hoffman welcomed everyone to the first Academic Affairs Committee meeting for the new academic year. She invited remarks from Commissioner Carlos Santiago and Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs, Patricia Marshall.

Commissioner Santiago began his remarks with a timeline of departmental efforts to reduce remediation. He highlighted that this important work started over five years ago in 2013 and stated that the presentations and recommendations made today before the board were the product of many years of work. He also reminded committee members that the last time updates were made to this policy area was in 1998.

IV. Presentations

List of documents used:
AAC Meeting Power Point, October 16, 2018
New Academic Programs Letter of Intent Template

A. Overview of Major Projects in Academic Affairs and Student Success

Deputy Commissioner Patricia Marshall provided an overview of FY2019 projects and focused on the following four topics: 1) creating a seamless system of transfer (MassTransfer); 2) open educational resources; 3) the new program approval process (LOI template); and 4) transforming developmental education

1. Mass Transfer

Deputy Commissioner Marshall reviewed the suite of programs comprising MassTransfer and provided committee members with a timeline for work in this area for FY19. She stated that in March of 2019, staff plan to bring the Common Transfer Principles for Four-year Institutions before the Board and that in the fall of 2019, Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 A2B Pathways will be up for review.

Secretary of Education Designee Tom Moreau asked if the DHE anticipated any significant challenges in this area. Deputy Commissioner Marshall responded that she and Director of Academic Policy and Student Success Elena Quiroz-Livanis, continue to work at maintaining the pathways (for alignment and transferability) through frequent faculty convenings. Committee Chair Hoffman expressed support for these efforts, adding students often pay for more courses than they need because of irregular advising and systemic barriers to transfer.

2. OER

Deputy Commissioner Marshall next discussed DHE's efforts for promoting the use of Open Educational Resources (OER) at our public institutions of higher education. She highlighted the creation of an OER Working Group to be led by Dr. Robert Awkward, Director of Learning Outcome Assessments at the DHE. Deputy Commissioner Marshall defined OER, provided data on why the Commonwealth should support the use of OER, described the charge to the OER Working Group, and reviewed the planned timeline for the work.

Board Member Fernando Reimers expressed his support for OER and its value for making college more affordable, especially for economically disadvantaged students. Pointing out that the OER strategy will depend greatly on existing faculty embracing the initiative, Board Member Reimers expressed concern regarding a potential lack of a broader strategy for impacting all faculty. He would like to see the system disrupted through OER requirements in faculty practices with the objective of bringing access and affordability to more students. Deputy Commissioner Marshall responded by highlighting the FY19 PIF grant focus on funding new initiatives around student affordability through the expansion of OER. She emphasized that several proposals the DHE received sought funding for OER implementation with the inclusion of faculty training and course delivery components.

Board Member Reimers asked if the DHE would consider aligning the OER initiative with campus strategic plans. Deputy Commissioner Marshall supported the idea and referenced her slide on the drafted letter of intent (LOI) under the new Program Approval process. She highlighted the questions focused on early college and affordability as an example of the DHE influencing policy in this area.

Committee Chair Hoffman asked about the relationship of big publishers within the OER movement and if DHE could provide an idea of the savings from OER and how the DHE and Board might work with publishers to learn about, and benefit from, low-cost options. She also

asked if the DHE could provide the Committee with research articles about OER so members can get a better understanding of the environment. Deputy Commissioner Marshall stated that she would send the Committee periodic updates throughout the year, including academic research. She added that the textbook industry (e.g., Cengage) is attempting to keep up with this initiative by providing low-cost materials. She also mentioned that Massachusetts' community colleges started a repository for OER materials.

Secretary of Education Designee, Tom Moreau, asked if the PIF RFP included a requirement for faculty involvement and, if not, how to get faculty involved and knowledgeable about available materials. Deputy Commissioner Marshall replied that training faculty on OER was a core component of the recent UMass and Salem State PIF grants and is a strategy integrated in several other PIF proposals. In fact, approximately half of this year's total PIF funds supported projects that include OER. Deputy Commissioner Marshall believes the working group for expanding OER will lead to the creation of faculty champions of the initiative. Referencing her time as a faculty member, she affirmed that faculty want to help students and she believes they will quickly realize how OER helps them to do so. The process of transitioning faculty to OER will require training on how to license material, how to secure OER champions to promote its benefits, and how to collect and present data on the impact of OER on student success.

3. LOI Template

Deputy Commissioner Marshall reviewed the Revised Program Approval Process and then gave an overview of the current status of the draft Letter of Intent (LOI) template. She also provided a timeline for advancing this work in FY19. Following Deputy Commissioner Marshall's remarks, Committee Chair Hoffman encouraged Board members to assess the LOI questions for logic and relevance or for missing questions.

Section A: Alignment with MA Goals

Deputy Commissioner Marshall provided an overview of adjustments made to section A of the LOI template based on campus feedback. Overall, campuses asked for more specific questions in the areas of pedagogy and system-level priorities. To address these concerns, several new questions were added to Section A, and this section now includes a link to the FY18 System-Level Strategic Framework. Deputy Commissioner Marshall emphasized that the information found at this link can and should be updated as the Board's priorities evolve.

Secretary of Education Designee Moreau asked about the origin of the FY18 System-Level Strategic Framework. DHE General Counsel, Dena Papanikolaou stated that it was not new, but rather a restatement of BHE established priorities, reformatted to be more user-friendly, and used as a framework for the annual presidential evaluation process.

Committee Chair Hoffman said it was important the Board not introduce new LOI questions that do not align with campus strategic plans and suggested members take a program the Board already approved as a case study on how the program would answer the LOI questions. Committee Chair Hoffman suggested this approach to ensure LOI questions are harmonious with campus plans and processes. She also added that it would be important for the Board to define the type of answers sought from each question.

Committee Chair Hoffman asked if it made sense to align the LOI with the FY18 System-Level Strategic Framework. Commissioner Santiago responded that the FY18 Strategic Framework

helped inform the DHE's work to create a statewide strategic plan. Community College Segmental Student Advisor Stephanie Teixeira noted that questions 8 and 9 might be better placed elsewhere. Secretary of Education Designee Moreau suggested moving the questions up under the first five questions following on program needs and stated that questions 6 and 7 are more aligned with program contributions.

Section B: Alignment with Campus Strategies

Deputy Commissioner Marshall described in detail adjustments that were made to Section B based on campus feedback. She stated that she eliminated question 1 regarding the rationale for the program and replaced it with a more detailed version of question 2. Question 3 was also amended to address concerns regarding the definition of the term "regional" and two new questions regarding the student learning outcomes and assessment strategies for the proposed program were added to this section.

Section C: Alignment with operational/financial modifications

Deputy Commissioner Marshall summarized changes made to Section C based on campus feedback. She stated that question 2 was amended to include enrollment projections for the first 5 years of the program. A question regarding institutional resources was also added to this section. Deputy Commissioner Marshall posed two questions to committee members regarding the inclusion of anticipated areas of employment for graduates and the attachment of a preliminary budget to the LOI template.

Committee Chair Hoffman expressed concern that the Committee was not well-suited for reviewing operational campus budgets/financials. Secretary of Education Designee Moreau recommended adding a question regarding anticipated areas of employment for students to Section A. Regarding the inclusion of a preliminary budget, Secretary of Education Designee Moreau stated that campuses should be asked to demonstrate their ability to maintain financial support for the program.

4. Transforming Developmental Education

Deputy Commissioner Marshall introduced the next topic, Transforming Developmental Education, as one of the agency's most important areas of policy work. She pointed out that approximately one-fifth of first-time degree-seeking students at our state universities end up in developmental math with more dire figures at our community colleges of nearly 50%. Deputy Commissioner Marshall then turned the presentation over to Director of Academic Policy and Student Success, Elena Quiroz-Livanis who emphasized the importance of creating a comprehensive approach to remediation reduction.

Director Quiroz-Livanis stated the pilot was constructed in a collaborative manner with our campuses and based on national research which suggested standardized tests do not accurately assess a student's ability to do well in college-level English and mathematics courses. She outlined a comprehensive approach to transforming developmental education, which includes the use of multiple placement measures, design of multiple math pathways, and access to co-requisite support. At this time, these successful interventions are too limited in scope and we need to bring promising practices to scale.

Director Quiroz-Livanis stated that the DHE contracted with the UMass Donahue Institute (UMDI) to conduct an independent evaluation of the campus GPA pilots, based on a request

from the Board. She turned the presentation over to Jeremiah Johnson, Senior Research Manager, to share initial results regarding UMDI's finding on one of several research questions: *"Did implementation of BHE's new assessment policies have impact on students' successful completion of their first college-level mathematics course?"* After reviewing the findings, Dr. Johnson explained the results, which indicated that students who entered college in fall of 2016 and were placed using GPA were no more or less likely than similar students who entered college in fall of 2013 to complete a college-level math course within two years. Director Quiroz-Livanis explained this was a "do no harm" finding since more students would be eligible to enter into college-level English and mathematics courses if campuses used GPA as their primary placement measure instead of Accuplacer. Committee Chair Hoffman stated that high schools spend a lot of money administering Accuplacer, so a benefit to eliminating this test is a reduction in costs. She also stated that the "headline" from this work should be that we are increasing the number of students who do not go into developmental education.

Committee Chair Hoffman asked if the standards among the pilots were the same across the institutions. Director Quiroz-Livanis replied the pilot types were refined after the first two years and campuses can use one of three variations to place students into college-level mathematics courses.

Regarding the timeline for moving forward, Director Quiroz-Livanis explained that UMDI would submit the final report to the Department on October 31. DHE staff would then review the findings and the UMDI analyses would be part of a broader report on the use of multiple placement measures. Director Quiroz-Livanis expected the DHE report would be shared with the institutions in November and campus stakeholders would have the opportunity to provide feedback before the AAC considered adopting GPA as a placement measure on December 4.

Committee Chair Hoffman suggested we not use the term "alternative" when referring to GPA as a placement strategy and Director Quiroz-Livanis agreed. Board Member Reimers pointed out that communication can be a challenge and it takes a long time before K-12 teachers and high school students learn about the changes. He suggested posting updates on social media and said communication was an integral part of the work. Committee Chair Hoffman suggested enlisting DESE Commissioner, Jeff Riley, for getting the word out regarding changes to the 1998 Common Assessment Policy.

Commissioner Santiago spoke about the negative impact remedial education has on students and stated that he welcomed the changes in developmental education. He also wondered if there was a way to link the resources necessary to successfully transform developmental education with Early College efforts.

V. MOTIONS

List of Documents Used

AAC Meeting PowerPoint, October 16, 2018

AAC Motions 19-02 through 19-03 new program motions

A. AAC 19-02 University of Massachusetts Amherst Master of Finance in Alternate Investments

Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Student Success, Winnifred Hagan, presented the program. The proposed program is intended to provide students with knowledge and skills in alternative investments. It is planned that the curriculum will cover private equity, venture capital, commodities, real estate, infrastructure investments, risk management and financial derivatives, green/sustainable finance, and hedge funds. UMA anticipates that graduates will be employed by financial institutions such as university endowments, pension funds, money managing firms, private equity firms, consulting companies, and governments as analysts, personal investment advisors, risk officers, compliance officers, traders, portfolio managers, consultants, researchers, and financial economists.

The external reviewers found the proposed curriculum to be excellent and the organizational framework to be well-conceived and that it covered the major areas in alternative investments. In addition, the team found introductory courses in corporate financial, data analysis and statistics, and derivatives and risk management to be a good preparation for advanced course work. Further, the curriculum was described by these reviewers as “having an excellent sequence of courses that cover all of the major topics in alternative investments and reflects a keen knowledge of where the field is at this time.”

The reviewers found the proposal to offer rich facilities, equipment, and other data/online resources to the students and that the Finance Department has all the relevant datasets to serve the proposed program. They noted that alternative asset management is a growing sector of the finance industry and it requires specialized knowledge quite different from standard neo-classical finance. They stated that there is no doubt there will be sustained demand for the program and demand in the institutional money management industry for graduates. They found the one-year program is standard in the industry.

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

Board Member Reimer pointed out that one of the assumptions of the program is that there would be robust investment and enrollment from overseas and he wondered if UMass was aware of proposed legislation at the White House to reduce the number of visas for Chinese students and others. Board Member Reimers also inquired as to why UMass was offering a residential program at a time when many of competitors are offering an equivalent online program.

Dr. Linda Enghagen, one of the UMass Amherst representatives, explained that the program would operate out of the Isenberg School, a school that follows a residential model to ensure quality. She stated that the Isenberg School starts programs on-campus, fully develops them, and then migrates them to the online space. Regarding visas for Chinese students, Dr. Enghagen added that UMass received approval for the STEM OPT (Optional Practical Training) classification. She explained that this designation means that international students have an opportunity to maintain their status in the US and extend their stay. OPT is not an option for online programs. UMass is confident that given the range of undergraduate majors this program targets, they will be able to draw a large enough class. To convey the scope of the program, Dr. Enghagen said the school is looking for a solid group of students with a cohort of 30-40 students per year. She also stated that UMass is prepared to launch the program in the fall of 2019 should the Board approve the program.

Board Member Reimers asked if the team, when designing the program, discussed with their provost how the program advanced the strategic plan of UMass Amherst, or if they considered the mission of the university to advance the social and economic goals of the state. Dr. Enghagen said such discussions occurred with an eye towards serving regional needs, including the states of Connecticut and New York. UMass plans include offering specialized, short-term, master's degrees to enable people to get a specialized education in a more direct career path. Undergraduate students in economics, statistics, mathematics, and finance will also be directed towards this program.

Committee Chair Hoffman expressed concern regarding UMass Amherst's reliance on a high percentage (75%) of international students. She also noted the high tuition rate and asked where the money would go – back to the university or department? Committee Chair Hoffman found the program academically rigorous but expressed concern related to the benefit of the proposed program to the MA economy. Dr. Enghagen responded that the original proposal included a high rate of international students, but if the school was to recast the proposal today, those rates would be lower. In reaction to the Trump Administration's proposed foreign student restrictions, UMass is recalibrating from where they plan to draw their students. UMass is using a domestic market survey to help provide answers. As for the tuition and fees, the money will go to the campus and be split between the central office and the Isenberg School. Committee Chair Hoffman appreciated the response but reiterated her concern of the 75% draw from foreign students, as it was not clear how Massachusetts students would benefit from the program.

Community College Segmental Student Advisor Stephanie Teixeira asked if the program gave preference to Massachusetts students already on campus. Dr. Enghagen replied that UMass gives enrolled and local students preference during the application process. For instance, UMass waives the application fee. Once the program is ready to launch, Dr. Enghagen said UMass would have established criteria for GMAT waivers if students received certain threshold grades in predictor courses.

Board Member Reimers said he views the program as siloed with planning disconnected from the campus strategic plan and statewide goals. He expressed affordability and accessibility concerns with the program, emphasizing that it fails to address the needs of MA students.

In light of the concerns raised by the committee, coupled with the institution's statement that it needed to recalibrate enrollment projections, Committee Chair Hoffman proposed that the members pass the motion provisionally or send the proposal back to be formally revised. Committee Chair Hoffman asked for General Counsel's recommendation.

General Counsel Dena Papanikolaou presented various options, noting that the Committee could 1) table the motion indefinitely; 2) advance the motion to next week's full board meeting without a recommendation and/or with request for supplemental information; or 3) amend and pass the motion provisionally with the requirements, such as the submission of supplemental information and/or quarterly or annual status reports.

Secretary of Education Designee Moreau reminded members that the program went through the UMass Board and, as a courtesy, the Committee should give the UMass Board an opportunity to answer and satisfy the concerns raised.

Dr. Enghagen replied that UMass would like the Committee to move the motion forward for full consideration of the Board subject to receiving additional information.

Committee Chair Hoffman suggested advancing the proposal to the full board without a recommendation, but asking UMass to produce a memorandum recalibrating and answering the concerns raised before the full Board (BHE) meets.

Community College Segmental Student Advisor Teixeira hoped the Committee and full Board would ensure MA students benefitted from the program and Board Member Reimer added that he remained concerned about the failure of the program to fully address equity and affordability so that all student populations would have the same opportunities.

Committee Chair Hoffman asked General Counsel Papanikolaou if she could read a motion into the record, taking into account the committee's comments. After further discussion and refinements suggested by the Committee, General Counsel suggested the following: "That AAC Motion 19-02 move forward without a recommendation for consideration by the full Board of Higher Education at its next regularly scheduled meeting, subject to receiving the following additional information: 1) updated data regarding the anticipated student population to be served, 2) a clearer picture of how the program connects to the University's mission; and 3) the program's relationship to affordability and access." Committee Chair asked of a motion on the suggested language; on a motion duly made and seconded, the following motion passed unanimously by all Committee members present:

AAC 19-02 APPLICATION FROM UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST TO AWARD THE MASTER OF FINANCE IN ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS

VOTED:

That AAC Motion 19-02 move forward without a recommendation for consideration by the full Board of Higher Education at its next regularly scheduled meeting, subject to receiving the following additional information: 1) updated data regarding the anticipated student population to be served, 2) a clearer picture of how the program connects to the University's mission; and 3) the program's relationship to affordability and access.

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

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

B. AAC 19-03 Thomas Aquinas College – New Institution Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts

Deputy Commissioner Marshall presented the program. Thomas Aquinas College has operated in Santa Paula California since 1978, and now seeks to open a branch campus in Massachusetts. Its mission is to provide a Catholic liberal education to undergraduate students, under the authority of the Catholic Church's Bishops and Pope. Liberal education is defined by Thomas Aquinas College as a course of studies desirable for the enrichment of life, as opposed to instruction in one discipline of study. It is further understood by Thomas Aquinas College as something which aims at the acquisition of knowledge regarding the fundamental arts and sciences. The goals of the College, which follow directly from its mission, involve instilling those

moral and intellectual virtues in its students, that have been determined by the institution's founders, to be derived from Roman Catholic theology. The Thomas Aquinas College branch campus site is intended to serve a small number of students with a required liberal arts curriculum and a small faculty.

Thomas Aquinas College has petitioned the MA Board of Higher Education for initial authorization to offer one baccalaureate degree program, operated from a branch campus in Northfield, MA on the former campus of the Northfield Mount Hermon School. Thomas Aquinas College received ownership of the Massachusetts property as a donation from the National Christian Foundation on May 2, 2017. The property includes 19 buildings, 7 houses and related infrastructure, including a steam power plant and piping network. In addition to donating the campus to Thomas Aquinas College, significant funding for the institution is initially being provided by the National Christian Foundation on the condition that Thomas Aquinas College match those funds through current and future fundraising efforts.

Since its initial application, the proposed institution has been thoroughly reviewed, including a site visit in August 2017, by a visiting committee and Board academic affairs, finance, and legal staff. There have been two extensive Committee Reports—one in October 2017 and another in December 2017-- with two extensive responses. After substantial review, comments and revisions, the committee found that Thomas Aquinas College had met many of the minimum requirements set forth by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the initial petition and in the subsequent responses to many of the findings. In the final analysis however, the Committee determined that they could not recommend Board approval of the Thomas Aquinas College petition without further modification and without further external analysis of the institutions' proposed financial structure and the institution's proposed hiring, admissions and student conduct practices, as a religiously affiliated institution. These issues surrounding the Financial Resources and Non-Discrimination standards, were referred DHE legal counsel and Thomas Aquinas College's legal counsel, to analyze the issues and make further adjustments to the proposal.

DHE Legal Staff worked closely with DHE Administrative and Finance staff to review Thomas Aquinas' proposed financial structure and to secure additional assurances regarding the institutions' capital planning assessments and fundraising goals, including secured pledges. DHE Legal Staff also worked closely with Thomas Aquinas' legal counsel to ensure that the institution's proposed plan to give preference in employment to those of the Catholic faith, and their intention to define and handle student conduct matters in a way intended to promote the institution's religious tenants were both consistent with state and federal law. Adjustments were subsequently made to the proposal to allow Thomas Aquinas' to proceed in this manner as a religiously affiliated institution under Massachusetts law. Such adjustments included amending the institution's admissions policy to exclusively limit the admission of students in Massachusetts to those of the Catholic faith, and clarifying student policies on disciplinary appeals, and the like.

Staff recommend that Thomas Aquinas College be approved for initial, conditional authorization. The conditions specified are primarily based on the fact that criteria related to faculty and tutors could not be evaluated, and the fact that criteria regarding "past, present and future financial stability," warrants close monitoring. Staff find that Thomas Aquinas College's proposal meets the requirements outlined with the conditions specified.

Board Member Reimer asked how the focus of Pope Francis on social justice issues, such as embracing immigrants, has influenced the intellectual life of the California campus. Thomas Aquinas President Michael McLean responded that the writings of the Pope have not been

formally integrated into the college's curriculum. However, the college's proactive funding campaign with the objective of making the collage affordable, and thus accessible, to all students responds directly to the Pope's message.

As a follow up to his initial question, Board Member Reimer inquired regarding the institution's fidelity to the Pope in all areas. Thomas Aquinas replied that they do follow the Pope's teachings and make their best efforts to include components of the 21st Century. However, since there have been many Popes with different standings, the college follows the general church teachings and maintains the elements of their proven curriculum.

Community College Segmental Student Advisor Teixeira asked if the Board needed to be concerned about the state's resources being spread too thin when granting new institutions approval to operate in MA. Committee Chair Hoffman noted that while the state does not have the same fiduciary responsibilities to private schools as it does to public institutions, ensuring private colleges are financially sound is of paramount concern. To that point, Secretary of Education Designee Moreau asked the Thomas Aquinas representatives about the financial health of their home campus in California, and whether the branch campus will be financially dependent on the home campus. President McLean stated that their efforts will focus on attracting a separate stream of students and reliance on funds from their California campus is not anticipated anticipate. He also pointed out that they have a prominent Christian funder for their Western MA location that should help build a strong foundation.

Secretary of Education Designee Moreau asked from where they would be selecting their faculty. Representatives from the institution stated that some of the California faculty would move to New England, and that the college will be hiring some new faculty from MA.

Secretary of Education Designee Moreau inquired why Thomas Aquinas was interested in establishing a campus in Massachusetts. Thomas Aquinas cited capacity issues at their California campus and the suitability of the Northfield site as their primary reasons for deciding to open a branch campus in MA.

On a motion duly made and seconded, AAC 19-03 passed unanimously by all Committee members present:

**AAC 19-03 THOMAS AQUINAS COLLEGE – NEW INSTITUTION
BACHELOR OF ARTS IN LIBERAL ARTS**

VOTED: The Board of Higher Education (BHE) hereby conditionally approves the Foreign Corporation Certificate of Registration, as amended, of Thomas Aquinas College for the purpose of operating a branch campus in Northfield Massachusetts with the authority to award the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts.

Provided further that the BHE will undertake to review, during the twelve year period set forth in 610 CMR 2.05(5), the continued progress of the institution toward meeting and maintaining compliance with the BHE's regulations, the visiting committee's recommendations, the goals and representations set forth in connection with the institution's petition to the BHE, and its compliance with the following conditions:

1. For the first five years of operation, the President shall submit to the Commissioner of Higher Education the credentials of faculty (i.e., tutors) hired to teach in the degree program.

2. For the first five years of operation, the institution shall submit to the BHE annual status reports providing narrative and statistical information on the institution's compliance with BHE standards and with the goals and representations set forth in connection with the institution's petition, including updates on:

- hiring and enrollment;
- finances, including fundraising efforts and philanthropic donations pledged and received;
- capital adaptation and renewal plans, including the financing of the same and deferred maintenance;
- plans for an overarching strategic planning process;
- governance of the new branch campus; and
- any other information as requested by Department staff.

3. The institution shall post on its website a notice regarding the conditional nature of the BHE's approval of the institution's degree granting authority, the exact language of which is to be determined by Department staff after consultation with the institution.

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

Contact: Patricia A. Marshall, Ph.D.
Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Student Success

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

There was no other business.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

On a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.