Chair Thomas convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and announced that Dr. Johnson would be participating by phone at 9:15 am pursuant to 940 CMR 29.10., since he was traveling, making it difficult for him to attend in person.

Chair’s Report
He stated that the committee was provided with a draft copy of the open session minutes of the November 10, 2017 meeting and asked for any corrections. With no corrections, the minutes were approved.

Chair Thomas provided an update on the open forums that were previously held on the Boston campus. He stated that there was a great turn out and participation from the Boston campus. He then updated the committee on the consultant work of President Hrabowski for the search. President Hrabowski and Chair Thomas spent time on the Boston campus on December 1st meeting with faculty and students. They also met with members of the Board of Visitors and local elected officials.

Discussion of Position Profile
Mr. Isaacson defined what the position profile is and described its purpose and intended usage. He provided an overview of the draft position profile and asked for feedback from the committee. He stated that the position profile themes are based on the input from the campus sessions. Mr.
Isaacson indicated that the day’s meeting would serve as a first-round decision about what the committee is looking for in the ideal candidate for the chancellorship on the Boston campus.

Mr. Moseley began with providing an overview of the mission and identity. He provided feedback received from members on the campus. Suggestions from the campus on the mission and identity of the position profile included:

- A leader with urban research enterprise experience
- Not someone who views the campus as an advanced community college
- A leader that will advance the narrative of a high-quality education
- Someone that will reverse the poor reputation that the school receives externally
- A leader that will improve graduation rates and retention rates
- Someone that will continue improving the investment and who will make all UMass Boston constituencies a priority
- A leader that will work to improve student engagement (new dormitory may increase low student activity)
- Because the campus is a ‘commuter campus’, students have not had the range of introduction to service learning and internships, however a new student activities department may help improve a higher level of engagement; the new Chancellor will need to pay attention to improving service learning opportunities

Mr. Isaacson stated that the facilities and substructure of the campus are also a concern. Although most of the campus community appeared to be proud of the investments into the campus infrastructure, there are concerns that the new Chancellor will be discouraged with what the campus community perceives as current financial issues due to the construction. He stated that management success will be a challenge. The lack of systems in place will require the new Chancellor to commit to reengineering processes with the help of internal talent. He stated that the sentiments expressed by the campus community reflects how vital it is that the new Chancellor continues to build the research enterprise and invests in the faculty. UMass Boston receiving an impressive $57 million in NIH research grants speaks to the quality of faculty on its campus.

Dr. Keller stated that fundraising was also a topic for discussion at the input meetings. He stated that corporate engagement is essential and that the next Chancellor for the Boston campus will need to work to develop a pipeline of opportunities for engagement.

Mr. Isaacson noted that many affluent universities use a variation of revenue centered system (RCM); modified RCM systems in higher education to address management issues and influence strategic planning. They also tend to follow economic models that focus on sustainability and incentive. UMass Boston will need a savvy and sophisticated leader with experience in developing, implementing, and executing a business model. The next incumbent will need to understand how to navigate in the current fiscal climate and how to plan for the future.

Chair Thomas asked for questions and discussion from the committee. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Isaacson provided an overview on mission and identity. He asked the committee for their thoughts.
Committee Feedback:

- UMass Boston serves first year generation, full time workers, minorities; and that should be considered when framing the engagement element of the position profile
- The 1989-91 Saxon Commission made very clear the positioning for what the University of Massachusetts campuses should be. Expectations from the Commonwealth for UMass Boston and UMass Lowell, alike, are research revenue intensive. It’s the duty of the leadership, faculty, and staff to reinforce what the mission and identity of the campus is while keeping that in mind
- Graduation retention rates will continue to be a challenge. For a long time, most of transfer students weren’t counted in the Integrated Post-Secondary Data Source (IPEDS). Data reports from Student Achievement Measurement (SAM) aren’t always accurate when looking at the numbers for transfer students
- The mission and identity should indicate the historical significance of a land grant university
- The Chancellorship role holds a distinguished seat in the minority community.
- Diversity must be understood to the extent of what the faculty contribute. Respect will be key.
- Commitment to diversity- diversity should be promoted in the University’s mission and identity
- Politics play a vital role in the city of Boston. The individual assuming the role of Chancellor should be politically astute of the operations and business of the city of Boston
- UMass Boston should not be viewed as a safety school

Comments during discussion included the need for UMass Boston to develop a relationship with secondary education institutions. Chair Thomas stated that several students that attend selective schools need remediation because they are not well prepared. Dr. Williams stated that the University must focus on creating pathways for development and academic excellence.

Mr. Isaacson provided an overview of the section on students. Mr. Campbell asked that in creating the section about the student body of UMass Boston, the current paradigm is considered; on average, issues with retaining students doesn’t stem from lack of knowledge or preparedness but because the students are parents or full-time employees who have to work to pay for a college education. He stated that we have to find a way to offset the costs of education so that UMass Boston can enroll and keep their students until they’ve obtained their UMass Boston degree.

Dr. Sugumaran added that financial stability is crucial to academic success. He stated that grants and financial aid must be available for students on the Boston campus as they determine whether they will enroll. Mr. Milkowski also believes that a new leader must commit to ensuring financial aid is accessible and plentiful for student success at UMass Boston.

Mr. Isaacson also briefly discussed facilities. He stated that the search firm intends to be transparent about the challenges on the campus and would be sure to hone in on the opportunities for renewal and redevelopment currently in progress. Mrs. Calise provided some background of the current projects on the Boston campus and stated that the next UMass Boston Chancellor should not be discouraged as construction is well underway and that the Administration and Finance team as well as the UMass Building Authority are currently working on strategic planning.
Chancellor Johnson stated that the committee must be careful in explaining the complexities of management and governance to the incoming Chancellor. He stated that there is a complexity and magnitude of the system that must be worked through and that should the next Chancellor for the Boston campus be unwilling to buy into the governance process they will not succeed at UMass.

Mr. Isaacson also provided an overview on the fundraising section of the position profile. Dr. Sugumaran stated that the next Chancellor will need to be a superb fundraiser for the Boston campus. Mr. Lewis agreed and impressed upon the committee the relevance of being an efficient networker in the city of Boston and having the ability to foster meaningful relationships with people in every sector.

Mr. Isaacson asked for feedback on the brand and marketing section of the position profile. Dr. Sugumaran noted that Dr. Freeman Hrabowski pointed out that in envisioning the potential reality of the Boston campus, it’s often compared to peer institutions. He stated that UMass should avoid comparisons and aspire to be good, if not, better than its peers. And should that message be successfully conveyed in the mission and identity, UMass Boston will see a significant change in who is willing to invest in the quality of the university.

Mrs. Calise stated that while developing the economic model it’s important to decide what type of leader the campus needs. She stated that the firm will need to be transparent about the finances. The Boston campus is currently behind the curve in terms of financial management and budgeting but a new leader will need to realize that it will happen incrementally over time. Dr. Williams added that the nominee for the chancellorship should also understand the dollar amount and how it pertains to online education and what it will mean for academic success.

Chair Thomas provided two options for finalizing the position profile and asked for discussion. Hearing feedback from the committee members, General Counsel Leone provided his legal counsel regarding what would be appropriate.

Mr. Campbell made a motion to delegate finalizing the position profile to the Chair. Mr. Milkowski seconded the motion. It was voted and approved unanimously by a single vote.

**Developing Candidate Pool**

Mr. Isaacson provided details about how the search firm plans to build the candidate pool. He stated that the firm would explore talent in the realm of government, nontraditional, academia, and large complex nonprofits. He asked for suggestions from the committee.

Dr. Adams expressed that the faculty on the Boston campus has concerns about the next chancellor not being selected from the academy. Dr. Desmond asked that the firm also consider high level philanthropic leaders.

Chair Thomas provided next steps and mentioned that the position profile would be shared with the committee and available on the secured website and then posted to the UMass Boston Chancellor website when approved for posting. Any feedback will be limited to those having input directly between the individual and the search firm.
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:14 a.m.

Christina Kelley  
Assistant Secretary Board of Trustees