

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMHERST•BOSTON•DARTMOUTH•LOWELL•WORCESTER

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**

**Wednesday, November 18, 2009; 12:00 p.m.
The University of Massachusetts Club Dining Room
225 Franklin Street – 33rd Floor
Boston, Massachusetts**

Committee Members Present: Chair Thomas; Vice Chair DiBiaggio; Trustees Boyle, Braceras, DeSisto, Furman, Johnston, Karam, King-Shaw, Koffman, Lawton, Osterhaus-Houle, Peters, Reville, Tocco, Woolridge and Young; Chairman Manning

Other Trustees: Trustee Hoyt

University Administration: President Wilson, Senior Vice President Williams, General Counsel Heatwole; Vice Presidents Chmura, Connolly and Smith; Dr. Udas, CEO, UMassOnline; Chancellors Holub, Motley, MacCormack, Meehan and Collins; Provosts Staros, Langley, Garro and Abdelal; Executive Deputy Chancellor/Provost Flotte; Associate Vice President Harrington; Professor Slatin, UMass Lowell; Professor McKinney, Dean UMass Lowell

Faculty Representatives: Professor May, UMass Amherst; Ms. Gibbs, UMass Dartmouth; Professor Tirrell, UMass Boston; Professor Carter, UMass Lowell

Guests: Representative Quinn, Ms. Xifaras, Chairwoman, SNESSL, Board, Professor Post, Touro Law School, Attorney Africana, Attorney Beauregard, Attorney Cohen

Chair Thomas convened the meeting at 12:09 p.m. and introduced and welcomed newly appointed Trustee members who have joined the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs: Norman Peters, Maria Furman and Victor Woolridge.

Chair Thomas indicated that he would be realigning the agenda to consider the Juris Doctorate matter as the proposal will take up the largest part of the meeting.

The Executive Session to consider Appointments with and Awards of Tenure as well Honorary Degree recipient names will take place at the end of the meeting.

Chair Thomas then asked for a motion to **Consider the Minutes of the Prior Meeting of the Committee.**

It was moved, seconded and

Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009

VOTED: To approve the minutes of the September 17, 2009 meeting of the Committee.

The Chair stated that before drilling down into the action item on the **Juris Doctorate**, it is reasonable to expect robust and spirited debate. Parties on both sides of the issue are passionate and serious minded. We should all welcome and respect the discourse. Any personal attack or lack of civility will not be accepted.

Chairman Manning presented opening remarks to frame the issue. When he first heard the University was going to accept the gift of a Law School, he questioned the timing but timing in life never comes along at an appropriate window. We are being offered a school with significant assets. We may not choose this particular Law School or location but it is what it is. The University doesn't have resources or wherewithal to consider anything else at this time.

The Chair noted that there has been an incredible amount of rumors, speculation, and false statements made around the Law School. He has asked for an independent audit by PriceWaterhouseCooper to give us an opinion. No one is getting any economic benefit from the deal. He acknowledged that membership on the Committees on Academic and Student Affairs and Administration and Finance has grown so that there would be a fulsome debate and opportunity for everyone to participate. Increasing membership was not an effort to stack the votes. Every Trustee will have a vote on this at the end of the day.

Chancellor MacCormack presented the proposal for a Juris Doctorate at UMass Dartmouth for the second time to the Board. She sees this as a way to seize and build opportunity for the University, to establish a public law program that builds on and advances the University's mission in a significant way. She recognizes that it must be a quality law program but noted that there is a track record of building quality at UMass Dartmouth.

Chancellor MacCormack introduced members of the Southern New England School of Law (SNE SL) faculty who demonstrate the quality of the teaching staff at the School. She also introduced several students to indicate the diversity and type of students that the School strives to serve.

Chancellor MacCormack presented a virtual tour of the Law School and noted that the total donation is worth \$22.7M - \$7.7M building and land, \$11.5M library resources, \$4.5M in equipment and furnishings, and \$1M in cash. A recent evaluation by Cushman Wakefield put the building worth at \$8.2M.

The Chancellor noted that the aspiration and objective is for the University to carry forward and provide an affordable, accessible and excellent legal education to a diverse group of students. SNE SL has very similar roots to Suffolk and New England School of Law and it is now time to take the leap forward that those schools have taken.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

The proposal addresses how the Juris Doctorate will advance the mission of the University, advance the University's commitment to educational opportunity, fill a gap in the public higher education curriculum, expand UMass Dartmouth's civic engagement profile, and build synergy with existing campus programs.

The Chancellor stressed that this is not creating another law school in Massachusetts but rather making one of the already existing law programs an affordable public option. She noted that the public option will give graduates more choices of practice when they finish, if they are saddled with a high debt.

The Chancellor talked about the demand for lawyers and employment opportunities and shared the goals of the Juris Doctorate proposal:

- Provide a public choice/increase opportunity;
- Add value and quality with a strong curriculum;
- Enroll first class, 2010;
- Present case for ABA accreditation, 2013;
- Improve first-time bar pass rate;
- Ensure high % job placement;
- Maintain diversity.

The Chancellor concluded her remarks by stating that this is an opportunity that should be seized, an opportunity that could turn into a tremendous asset for the University. The Chancellor remembered when the Medical School set expectations to be in the top 25 medical schools. The arguments used against the establishment of the Medical School are the same arguments that are being used against the establishment of a public law program option.

President Wilson commented that he had sent a formal detailed recommendation to the Trustees to accept the donation and establish the Juris Doctorate program. He wanted to strongly reinforce the recommendation that has been made. A Public law option exists in 44 states and should exist in Massachusetts. He noted that Chancellor MacCormack has developed a comprehensive proposal for achieving program goals without drawing on state funds. The discussion today is focused on the academic issues of the Juris Doctorate program; in future weeks we will discuss the financial issues of the donation and the program at the Administration and Finance meeting. The full Board will have an opportunity to discuss the issue in December. He thanked the Chancellor for her work in preparing the proposal and other documents for review.

Trustee Reville began his comments by welcoming the three new Trustees. He noted, on behalf of the Governor, appreciation to SNESE for the gift that they were offering the University. He was also appreciative of the Chancellor and staff putting the proposal in front of the Board. He has been unimpressed by the tone of some of the criticism. He is concerned with the financial implications and has studied those closely and looks forward to learning more. The

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

Governor sees this as an opportunity to enhance the University and extend educational opportunity by making affordable legal education an option for many residents. He noted he would cast his ballot based on the best interests of the Commonwealth and the University.

Trustee Braceras began by welcoming new colleagues on the Board and noting that she is a graduate of UMass Amherst and the Harvard Law School. Chair Thomas asked if she intended to make a major statement and Trustee Braceras responded that she was looking for a chance to make her statement. Chair Thomas indicated that he had a determined order for comments; following the presentation by the Chancellor and comments from the Board Chair, the President and the Secretary, he was going to allow for public comments. After the motion has been made and seconded, Trustees will have an opportunity to speak.

The Chair opened the floor for public comments. Speakers were asked to limit their remarks to three minutes. Those making comments included Representative Quinn; Professor Ernest May, UMass Amherst; Margaret Xifaras, Chair, SNESL Board; Deborah Post; Attorney Carolina Africano; Attorney Phil Beuregard; Jerry Cohen; MBA Foundation. All spoke in favor of the proposal with the exception of Professor May.

Professor May spoke in place of Randall Phillis, MSP President and distributed a memo from Mr. Phillis stating his rejection of the formation of the Law School.

The motion was then made and seconded:

To recommend that the Board take the following action:

Notwithstanding previous action by the Board, to approve the Juris Doctorate at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth as contained in Doc. T09-074.

Vice Chair DiBiaggio spoke to the motion. He noted that he is deeply respectful of those who have an opposite view on this motion. There are debates that should occur on this proposal. We are blessed to have many distinguished law schools in Massachusetts; however, we do not have a public law school and we are one of very few in the nation. In many states, the public law school is the distinguished law school in the state. There are a number of students who cannot afford to attend private law schools and they should have an opportunity. There were criticisms in the establishment of the Medical Center. However, in balance, the review team agreed that there was great potential in providing a public medical school which provided access to students. We can all be very proud that the state did go ahead with that Medical Center. This is an analogous situation. We have an opportunity to have a public law program. Under the aegis of this University we would move ahead and in time have an extraordinary law school as we have a Medical School.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

Vice Chair DiBiaggio noted the importance of this University to this state is measured by the fact that it provides opportunity and access to those who might not otherwise have it and while sensitive to the arguments that are made, he endorses this proposal with the belief that this University can develop and build a school of law of which we can be very proud.

Chair Thomas stated that we would go around and offer to all Trustee members the opportunity to make initial comments. He reminded the members that this is the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs. Its principal role is to review the academic elements of the proposed Juris Doctorate program. The Committee on Administration and Finance has the responsibility to review the financial implications and viability of the proposal.

Trustee Braceras began her remarks by noting that she is one of only a handful of members of the Board who are both attorneys and graduates of the University. Her passion for this issue stems from a love of the University, a love of law, and an appreciation for what it takes to provide a truly first-rate legal education. She stated her belief that we are about to make a horribly expensive mistake that will divert resources from students and devalue the reputation of the University.

The question, according to Trustee Braceras, is not whether the University should have a law school but whether we should accept *this proposal for this law school at this time*.

Trustee Braceras argued that the application relies on distorted information about the state's legal economy. The legal market has contracted dramatically since 2008. Law firms are laying off employees and canceling offers. Many public interest offices and government legal departments have hiring freezes. Excellent students at BC, BU and Harvard Law are having trouble finding jobs. The legal job market is shrinking, but you would never know it from this application. The application deliberately glosses over these facts and creates a deceptively rosy picture of job prospects for graduates of a state run law school.

Trustee Braceras further argued that SNESL is the wrong vehicle for creating a public law school. SNESL is an unaccredited school with dismal bar passage rates and a generally undistinguished faculty. Why should we bail out a failing law school? Why should we build a state law school upon such a shoddy foundation? Certainly, we should not absorb SNESL faculty. This is a faculty unable to improve the reputation of the school or attract high quality students. Why not start from scratch by recruiting new faculty members and a Dean hired away from an accredited law school?

Trustee Braceras stated that Chancellor MacCormack wants to have things both ways – the Chancellor claims she will create a high quality law school with a first-rate student body and a national reputation (like UConn Law) but bases her argument in favor of approval on the need to serve South Coast residents who do not want to drive to Boston to attend law school. It is unclear how the Chancellor plans to resolve the tension between creating a nationally respected law school and a commuter school for local, second-career students.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

Trustee Braceras argued that the issue of access is a red herring. There are many ways to increase access to legal education that don't include UMass absorbing SNESL. Moreover, if SNESL is already providing access to non-traditional students (as they have bragged here today), then why does UMass need to step in? Let SNESL continue doing what it is doing.

Trustee Braceras then questioned the timing of the proposal. Why not take more time to consider the issues? Why not appoint an independent committee of former judges and lawyers to study the issue? The financial model proposed here is contingent upon a matriculating class in September 2010. Financial projections that depend on rushing into this deal are clearly unsound.

Trustee Braceras concluded by reminding people that she is not opposed to increasing access to legal education or to creating a law program at UMass. But this is not the right time or the right vehicle, and the application is not submitted for the right reasons.

Trustee Osterhaus-Houle spoke next. She noted that much analogy has been made to the Medical School and she is grateful for her education there. Access is key and agrees that the Commonwealth should have a public law school. She applauds this opportunity but has some reservations regarding financial information and looks forward to the Committee of Administration and Finance for further discussion.

Trustee Lawton followed and reminded Board members that he had circulated letters to the Board regarding the process. Under consent decree, the Trustees were not really involved; employees of University were doing the review. His main complaint is process. As a Trustee, he served on the Budget Oversight Committee. We are in an ever declining state of support. If not for stimulus money this year, we would have been in dire straits. Going from campus to campus, we could see how the University is dealing with the financial crisis. When we went to the Dartmouth campus, there was a shortfall of \$16M. To think that we are now branching out to serve the needs of everyone seems unlikely. The Dartmouth campus envisioned the ATMC to help local economy. It is now a casualty of the economy. They've lost a substantial amount of funding. Not being privy to information that the Chancellor and others have on the financials, he indicated his position of opposition because of the lack of information to make the decision. This is only the first round. There are two more rounds and we'll look more into the finances in the next round. To support this measure would take away from the rest of the system and he is hoping that some of the questions will be answered by the full Board meeting.

Trustee Johnston began his remarks by noting that the whole issue of graduate professional schools at UMass has troubled him for decades. He fought for a school of social work in the 1980's and was trampled by the private universities who saw it as a threat. The privates also saw the Medical School as a threat. He noted that he has not heard that any of the private medical schools have gone out of business as a result of the public medical school. We should not be proud that we don't have a law school or a school of social work of a high caliber as the Medical School. If we are going to have a world class state University we need a law school just as we needed a medical school. Everyone around this table is here because of the existence of the

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

University of Massachusetts. I believe every student should have the opportunity to go to a first class public law school.

Trustee Reville stated that he was going to reserve his time. He has already indicated his strong interest for this proposal and hopes we will spend time on questions regarding the proposal to which the Chancellor can respond.

Trustee Peters noted that the issue for this Commonwealth is whether the University needs a law school to be a world class University. He too can remember the issues raised regarding the Medical School. In looking at this Committee and his role, he indicated that he is in favor of the University having a public law school. There is a demand for legal education.

Trustee Karam responded to Trustee Lawton by noting that the ATMC has been highly successful. It has been entrepreneurial and an entrepreneurial spirit on every campus is what has made the University work and this is another opportunity.

Trustee Karam then requested that Trustee Lawton share a copy of his letter about the Law School process with all the members of the Board at which time Trustee Lawton agreed to do so.

Trustee Karam stated that the Chancellor is the best financial manager we have in the system. She has managed under duress and done an excellent job. There is no doubt in my mind that she can manage a program of this size and has difficulty listening to critics. Second and third tier programs are going to review our institutions; this is totally hypocritical. This proposal provides opportunity and a missing program in our system.

Trustee Furman began by saying she has come up with four or five points to respond to Trustee Braceras. As a graduate of UMass Dartmouth, great schools were already here. One could have argued then that we didn't need public higher education. The fact that we are over schooled is not an argument; we need public options. The second point regards the students and passing the bar. If you pass the bar, you are smart. The third point was damage to the University. I have no doubt that the Chancellor can do the job. Economic times – yes, bank jobs are not coming back, financial services, real estate. The same thing is going to happen to the legal profession. That doesn't mean that other areas like MBA are going to shut down. A yes vote is a vote for optimism.

Trustee Boyle noted that the correct statement was made by Trustee Reville when he said he was in favor of the proposal but looks forward to further information. He indicated that he sent a FOIA request to the University but hasn't received any information. People who have put on a presentation and provided information are the proponents of the proposal. What is wrong with the Trustees having their own information? Trustee Boyle also stated that it was not the Board's responsibility to stimulate the economy of Bristol County.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

The one document that is important is the ABA report and he has not been able to get that report. We can talk about access but we have a fiduciary responsibility and can ask for further information. We've only had 30 days since we learned about this program.

In response to Trustee Boyle, Chairman Manning noted that he had engaged PriceWaterhouseCoopers to perform an audit.

Trustee Woolridge began by noting that he had less than 30 days to study this proposal and is an analyst by trade. This Board has approved this in the past; it has gone through all the processes in the past. It approved a law school at this location in the past. It went to the BHE and through a technicality came back to this Board. The fiduciary responsibility requires us to utilize the process already in place. The process is to come through this Committee, then come through the Committee on Administration and Finance and then go on to the BHE. With respect to independent reviews of data, PricewaterHouseCoopers and Cushman Wakefield have their standards to provide data. Information from third parties should be reviewed carefully but the Board should not go off and hire its own experts.

Trustee Woolridge stated that he has looked at the information and the institution does not meet the standards of the University. As an investment, that is an opportunity, an opportunity to "buy low and grow." The opposing opinions seem to be more about process. Process can be dealt with by joining in an established process. With a net add of 318 students over five years, and no indication that this would be financially taxing to the University, this seem reasonable. We can allow or impede the process and stated he is in favor to allow it.

Trustee Hoyt spoke next and indicated that 9,500 students at UMass Dartmouth thanked SNESL for the generous donation. The proposed school fits well with our mission. He also recognized that it has helped revitalize the South Coast region of the state. Students are constantly doing outreach during our undergraduate years. This donation means that a public law school will be established without any cost to the state. We are concerned that private institutions are seeking to influence the decisions of the University.

Trustee DeSisto stated that there needs to be an opportunity for students to engage with people who have achieved their potential in law. Students at UMass Boston are supportive of the proposal. As a member of the Committee on Administration and Finance we know that the Medical School is being run very well and expect the same from the Law School. She questioned as to whether the \$1M gift is to cover \$1M in debt that they owe. Trustees, even those opposed, will help the law school succeed if the proposal is passed.

Trustee Koffman referred to his second year on the Board. Timing, finances, independent studies were all red flags when the proposal was first raised. Most of us favor a public law school; the question is whether this is the right way to do it? His belief is this is the right opportunity for students and the Commonwealth to have a less expensive option for law school.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

Trustee Young declared what he had heard about LSAT scores and bar pass rates do not tell the story of future success of an applicant. The essence is the quality of the student and desire for the degree and is in support of establishing a public law school at UMass Dartmouth.

Trustee Tocco spoke next. As a member of the Board of Higher Education during the last law school debate, he stated that this is a better proposal. It was not a technicality the last time but an abrogation of state law that stopped that proposal. He stated his frustration by the distraction this is causing at the University. We need a concentrated focus on the financial crisis and as much passion and as much time should be spent on the cost of education as on this issue. He is also frustrated that we spend as much time on other programs but this has been short-circuited.

Trustee Tocco then offered an amendment to the main motion:

That we cap tuition and fees for all students at UMass Dartmouth to 3% for all students for this period of time.

The amendment was Moved and Seconded.

General Counsel Heatwole ruled that the amendment is not germane to the motion on the floor and is beyond the scope of the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs.

Trustee Tocco withdrew his amendment. He stated his disbelief that it won't cost anyone money. If it isn't accurate, or we make a mistake, the financial burden will fall on the students and families of UMass Dartmouth.

Trustee King-Shaw spoke next indicating that he has read a lot and heard a lot about this issue. The notion that we have so many law schools is interesting. None of them is endowed with a commitment to public service. No law school is endowed with the endemic commitment to public service. The argument that there are too many lawyers doesn't take into account that there are many uses for a law degree; there is no single use for the law degree. There may not be a market for corporate lawyers but there is a market for those who bring legal thinking to a number of areas of life. Why does someone want a law degree? It could be for a number of reasons.

The other element in sub-text is why UMass Dartmouth and why this law school? If we were going to place a public law school in the system, we could make an argument for Amherst as the flagship, Boston as a hub, Worcester as the center of the state, and Lowell for the Marty Meehan School of Law and Public Policy. However, there are compelling reasons for the Dartmouth campus. This is not a start-up venture. There is a foundation to build on. The proposal at hand is an opportunity that does not come every day and is not likely to come again. We may find it is a superior financial investment at this time. He argued that as a public institution we should support economic development in the South Coast and finds no reason in this Committee today

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

to stop the process.

Chair Thomas stated he would like to make two brief comments. Big strong viable companies buy companies that are struggling every day and he does not foresee this particular opportunity being one that puts the University of Massachusetts system or its brand at risk because it is venturing in an entrepreneurial manner. We are in a demographic revolution with respect to the world. Diversity is at our door step and permeating all of our communities. SNESL has a history of having a diverse population within its academic walls. There are a number of underrepresented groups that do not access professional schools. You have to have a point of entry. There is no rational case for not offering the citizens of Massachusetts an affordable legal education. The financial vetting in the Committee on Administration and Finance needs to happen, and that notwithstanding that, this should happen.

Trustee Braceras asked why the urgency? We've heard other Trustees say they have asked for information and haven't received it. Why do we need to decide this today?

Trustee King-Shaw responded that the one thing that does concern him is that there are Trustees asking legitimate questions and they have not received answers. If there are financial statements not given, or audits that have not been done, he expects that to be done but that shouldn't hold up the academic decision in this Committee.

Trustee Braceras asked about the ABA report. Trustee Boyle noted that that question goes to the heart of the proposal. Trustee Thomas indicated that he was not sure that the decision turns on what the ABA has to say.

Chancellor MacCormack responded by stating that we are presenting a proposal different than what the American Bar Association saw for accreditation. Trustee Braceras countered by noting it would be the same students, same classes for a couple of years. Chancellor MacCormack noted that we are inviting the students in academic good standing to come in to the new Law School.

Trustee Johnston called the question; it was seconded.

Chair Thomas pointed out that it requires a 2/3 vote for closing debate. Secretary DeVico conducted a roll call vote. The motion passed with a 2/3 vote.

The President asked if we can get the ABA report and Chancellor MacCormack indicated that it will be available before the December 10th Board meeting.

Secretary DeVico conducted a roll call vote on the motion. It was

Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009

VOTED: To recommend that the Board take the following action:

Notwithstanding previous action by the Board, to approve the Juris Doctorate at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth as contained in Doc. T09-074.

The Chancellor stated she will be happy to provide the last ABA report but stressed it is to be treated with confidentiality. She asked that no information be released into the public arena.

Chair Thomas indicated it was time to move onto the three other action items. The first action item was the **Appointment of Professor David Harlan to the William and Doris Krupp Professorship in Medicine at the University of Massachusetts Worcester and the Appointment of Professor Demetrius Litwin to the Harry M. Haidak Professorship in Surgery at the University of Massachusetts Worcester.**

It was moved, seconded and

VOTED: To recommend that the Board take the following action:

To concur with the President in the appointment of Professor David Harlan to the William and Doris Krupp Professorship in Medicine at the University of Massachusetts Worcester.

And further, To concur with the President in the appointment of Professor Demetrius Litwin to the Harry M. Haidak Professorship in Surgery at the University of Massachusetts Worcester. (Doc. T09-072)

The second action item was the **Appointment of Professor Guangping Gao as the First Holder of the Penelope Booth Rockwell Chair in Biomedical Research at the UMass Worcester,** contingent on the Establishment at the December 2nd Committee on Administration and Finance of the Penelope Booth Rockwell Chair in Biomedical Research at the University of Massachusetts Worcester.

It was moved, seconded and

VOTED: To recommend that the Board take the following action:

To concur with the President in the appointment of Professor Guangping Gao as the first holder of the Penelope Booth Rockwell Chair in Biomedical Research at the University of Massachusetts Worcester, contingent on the establishment at the December 2nd Committee on Administration and Finance of the Penelope Booth Rockwell Chair in Biomedical Research at the University of Massachusetts Worcester. (Doc. T09-073)

Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009

Chair Thomas asked Provost Abdelal, Professor Slatin and Professor McKinney to present the **B.S. in Environmental Health, UMass Lowell**. Professor Slatin presented the issue related to the connection of environment and health. There is a need for students to understand how to manipulate the environment for good health. This was a goal when the school was created five years ago. This would be the first program in this field in New England. Much of the curriculum is already in place. The goal is to establish the program and provide a track into the MS program. The department has the resources needed for the first three years; if there is sufficient enrollment, there will be a need for another faculty member. We are going for conditional accreditation from the National Environmental Health Sciences and Protection Accreditation Council. Fifteen students are expected each year for the first four years. There are not many high school students who understand what this field entails but as the program get underway, it will be easier to create examples for high school students and create outreach opportunities. There are outreach programs in other areas as well within the school. Trustee Karam asked if there was any input from engineering programs and suggested that this be an avenue of conversation. There was a strong response from the review panel.

It was then moved, seconded and

VOTED: To recommend that the Board take the following action:

To approve the B.S. in Environmental Health at the University of Massachusetts Lowell as contained in Doc. T09-071.

Chair Thomas then announced that the Committee would enter into **Executive Session** to consider **Appointments with Tenure, UMass Dartmouth, Lowell and Worcester** and **Awards of Tenure, UMass Boston, Dartmouth and Worcester** and **Honorary Degrees, UMass Amherst, Boston, Dartmouth, and Worcester**.

The Committee will not reconvene in Open Session, and the Secretary will call the Roll.

It was moved, seconded and

VOTED: To enter into **Executive Session** for the purpose of considering **Appointments with Tenure, UMass Dartmouth, Lowell and Worcester** and **Awards of Tenure, UMass Boston, Dartmouth and Worcester** and **Honorary Degrees, UMass Amherst, Boston, Dartmouth, and Worcester**.

Chair Thomas voted for the motion as did Trustees Furman, Karam, Koffman, Lawton, Peters, Reville, Woolridge, Young and Chairman Manning.

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
November 18, 2009**

The time was 3:00 p.m.

Barbara F. DeVico
Secretary to the Board of Trustees