

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STRATEGIC PLANNING & ACADEMIC & SYSTEM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TALLAHASSEE-LEON COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
LOWER LEVEL, MEETING ROOM A-1
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
NOVEMBER 20, 2008

Ms. Pappas convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Academic and System Oversight Committee of the Board of Governors at 10:15 a.m., in the Tallahassee-Leon County Civic Center, Tallahassee, Florida, November 20, 2008, with the following members present: Frank Martin, Co-chair; John Dasburg; Ann Duncan; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Sheila McDevitt; Arthur "AJ" Meyer; Ava Parker; Tico Perez; Carolyn K. Roberts; Commissioner Eric Smith; Dr. Judy Solano; Gus Stavros; John Temple; and Norman Tripp.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held September 25, 2008

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held September 25, 2008, as presented. Ms. Duncan seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Review of Committee Work Plans

Ms. Pappas said that Board members had a chart in their materials with a timeline for Forward by Design Strategic Action Initiatives. She said this showed a concise direction for the work of the Committee over the next 18 months. She acknowledged the work of the Committee under the leadership of Mr. Dasburg in preparing the "first generation" Strategic Plan project for this Board of Governors. She said the Board now faced changing circumstances and new directions, including SUS participation in economic development initiatives for the state. She said the Committee would now be working on several specific initiatives to chart the course for the University System. She noted that the economic climate heightened the need to address the issue of how to fund and build excellence. It was also critical that the Board align the universities and their missions. This was now more important as the state was looking at developing a new state college system, and the Board needed to determine the SUS relationship with these new colleges. She said the Committee would also be engaging in discussions with the universities regarding mission, vision and priorities, and gathering data to inform alignment discussions. The Committee would also create and implement a strategy to align institutional strategic plans with System and State goals, challenges and opportunities and the role of each institution in producing its share of System goals, and achieving excellence for the institutions and the System. She said this was not an easy discussion, and the universities might not agree with the Board's conclusions.

Ms. Pappas said the Board needed a clear understanding of each university's vision and mission. The Committee would roll these up to develop the System mission out to 2025. She said the Board needed to consider the costs of different alternatives. She said she hoped the result of this work would provide a vision of how dollars and funding related to the end product.

Mr. Martin inquired about the timeframe for the discussions. Ms. Pappas said she envisioned that it would take about six months to lay out all the options and to work cooperatively with the universities. She said this alignment process should be completed by June 2009, so the Board could then proceed with the project on appropriate and predictable funding.

Mr. Tripp inquired about the development of the University Compacts. Ms. Pappas said initially these Compacts were being developed before the funding piece was completed. She said this was putting the cart before the horse, as the Board should first complete the alignment of university missions. She said the Board could not discuss funding until it knew what the System would look like. She said staff would be meeting with the Provosts to discuss achieving their institutional mission with the resources they had. She said the Committee did not need to re-invent the wheel. This would be a fact-gathering exercise. She said she had asked staff to present the Committee with a succinct articulation of other institutions and systems and emulate those which would fit Florida. She said the Committee might need to hold several workshops.

Mr. Dasburg said he was struggling with the first item on the list, focused missions and University Compacts. He said if the Board could not reach consensus on that, it could not have a meaningful discussion of baccalaureate degrees and system structure. He said the Board should first achieve consensus as to mission, and debate system structure at a later date. He said the Board did need to resolve how many universities Florida should have. Ms. Pappas agreed, and suggested a workshop on the topic of structure. Mr. Dasburg said the Board might want to invite the Pappas Consulting Group to help moderate that discussion.

Ms. Parker echoed Ms. Pappas' kudos for the work on strategic planning done by Mr. Dasburg and his committee. She noted that the Board had adopted its Forward by Design initiatives prior to the creation of the new Florida College System by the Legislature, the Distance Learning Task Force or the appointment of Commissioner Smith. She said the Board needed to step back and define the role of the State University System as it related to degree production and other public and private postsecondary institutions in Florida before being able to determine the role of distance learning, collaborative relationships, service areas, branch campuses and other educational sites. She said Commissioner Smith would take the lead on Readiness initiatives; Dr. Solano would take the lead on distance learning initiatives; and Mr. Dasburg would take the lead on the discussions related to system structure.

Ms. Parker commented that the work of the State College Task Force would have an impact on the role of the SUS and the Board's decisions relating to baccalaureate degree production. She said staff were participating in the Task Force discussions. She said the report from the Distance Learning Task Force should be completed by January. She said there were activities regarding Readiness, Access and Success at the national level in which the Commissioner was involved, and he would report on those. She said she hoped that by March, the Board would be in a position to adopt certain principles regarding the role of the SUS and degree production. She said one issue regarding distance learning and various collaborative relationships was whether service areas should be designated. She said the Board might need to adopt regulations dealing with off-campus learning sites. In addition, the Board might need to develop a process for separate campuses becoming stand-alone institutions.

Mr. Perez said that he would be leading a team on appropriate and predictable funding. He explained that the work plan laid out a few key milestones in the development of a funding model that would be a departure from the current approach. This would build an LBR around cost increases and quality improvements for all students, rather than just incremental enrollment. He said he expected to complete this work by the beginning of 2010 for the 2010 budgeting cycle. He said the funding model working group, including representatives from all 11 institutions and the BOG, had met the previous day. He said they had developed a detailed outline of a funding model and were working through the parts of the model. He said the group planned to report on its progress at the March Board meeting.

Mrs. Roberts reported on the work plans for workforce, research, and economic development and for medical education. She said these initiatives were linked by their importance to the State University System and to Florida's future. She said that the potential of the universities to transform Florida's economy as engines of economic development was now appreciated by the Legislature, the Governor and by business and industry. She noted that innovation was one of the most valued products of the SUS. She said that securing additional funding for the existing medical schools and ensuring the success of the newly created medical schools would provide a tremendous economic boost while, at the same time, addressing one of Florida's most critical issues, i.e., the provision of adequate healthcare.

Mrs. Roberts said the big picture goals for her subcommittees were as follows: 1) to demonstrate that the Board was aligning its efforts with regard to workforce and providing the right skill sets for graduates to compete in a global economy; 2) to better tell the story of SUS accomplishments in research and economic development so the Board could be entrusted with more funding; 3) to work toward an optimal relationship with business and industry; and 4) to ensure that the new medical schools were accredited and that all the medical schools in the SUS were appropriately funded.

Mr. Martin explained that the Academic Programs Team had been created as an initial point team for the review of academic issues for the full Strategic Planning and Academic and System Oversight Committee. He said the Team would review academic program proposals, and forward its recommendations to the full Committee for consideration and action. He said a primary component of the work would focus on academic program approval, review and termination, which would be guided by the BOG regulations which had been revised in the Spring.

Ms. Pappas noted that the Committee and its work teams had full agendas.

3. University and System Strategic Priorities: Alignment and Accountability: Areas of Strategic Emphasis; SUS Enrollment Plans

Ms. Pappas said there were two issues related to the Board's Forward by Design efforts, the areas of strategic emphasis and the issue of SUS enrollment plans.

Mrs. Roberts noted that the Board had reviewed areas of strategic programmatic emphasis at its June meeting, and had discussed the benefits to identifying these areas. Since then staff had discussed these areas with several important partners in workforce and economic development, such as the Council of 100 and the Chamber of Commerce, and they had provided positive feedback. When these areas were populated with new and existing degree programs, she said this would assist the Board to have meaningful dialogues regarding university missions and compacts, accountability, and performance funding. She said these would also provide a tool for demonstrating alignment with the state's economic and workforce needs.

Ms. Pappas said she was concerned about removing the area of high wage jobs. She recommended this should continue as a strategic emphasis, as it was her belief that it was a problem in Florida that, as a state, wages were not improving at a pace to keep up with the rising costs of living in the state.

Mr. Martin moved that the Board approve the revised areas of programmatic strategic emphasis identified in the 2005-2013 SUS Strategic Plan, as presented. Mrs. Roberts seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Ms. Pappas said that the previous year, the Board had voted to limit freshman enrollment growth for three years. She said the Board in September had started discussing whether that limitation should remain in place. She said the Board had noted that the budget conditions which drove that decision had not improved, but that there should be flexibility to allow exceptions to the policy. She said that Florida Gulf Coast University had requested an exception. She noted that Board members had inquired about the impact of the policy on the universities and about criteria for exceptions.

Chancellor Rosenberg said staff had spoken with all 11 institutions about the impact of the limitation, how their enrollment plans might change if it were not in place, and their opinions on criteria for exceptions. He reported that most of the universities said they would not grow or would stay within the funded plan with or without a limitation on freshman enrollment growth. He noted that some had expressed the desire to expand access at the freshman level, but pointed to budget constraints limiting their capacity to do so. He reported the comments on criteria for making exceptions, as follows: 1) allow no exceptions; 2) consider cases where there was capacity, the ability to fund growth with marginal tuition dollars alone, and an understanding that no request would be made to fund over-enrollment; 3) consider other factors, such as populations served and demand in the region; and 4) delegate the decision to local boards. He said he continued to be concerned about adding students in the face of budget cuts already made and more expected, particularly with the Governor's statements that morning and his statement of commitment to excellence for the State University System.

Dr. Rosenberg said FGCU had made a specific request for an exception. He said he was concerned about the impact on quality of funding growth with tuition alone, but said that he also recognized FGCU's debt service obligations that depended on significant growth. He said he would recommend making an exception for FGCU, and would review others should they be formally submitted.

Ms. Pappas moved that the limitation on freshman enrollment growth should remain in place; that exceptions should be made with the understanding that no request would be made later to go back and fund over-enrollment; and that universities seeking exception to the policy should submit a formal request and justification to the Chancellor for consideration, again, with the understanding that no request would be made to go back later and fund over-enrollment. Dr. Solano seconded the motion.

Ms. Parker inquired about the criteria which would be used to determine whether a university might seek an exception. Ms. Pappas pointed to Dr. Rosenberg's comments from the universities, and said these would be cases as identified in point 2. She said she shared Ms. Parker's concern about defining the criteria, as the requests should not be arbitrary, but should be compelling cases for exceptions to the policy. She said the Board would have to rely on the Chancellor to evaluate the requests.

Mr. Dasburg said he had originally opposed the cap, and continued to oppose it. He said he welcomed requests for exceptions. He said he believed the universities should make this decision. He said he would lift the cap and trust the universities to make the best decision. Mr. Perez concurred, and agreed that the Trustees were in the position to make the determination as to their capacity.

Mr. Tripp agreed that the Boards of Trustees were in place to make the best determination on enrollment capacity. He said each university's Board of Trustees should decide the number of students they could handle. He said with the changes in

tuition already within the discretion of the university boards, the trustees would have a better sense about their university's needs.

Dr. Solano said the Board had made a bold statement in adopting the limitation on freshman enrollment growth about preserving the excellence of the State University System. She said the Board had taken this action when the economy had begun to falter in order to preserve excellence. She said nothing had changed. If anything, the economy had worsened. She said she saw no reason to turn away from the policy adopted the previous year. She said she also viewed this as a System statement, that all the universities should hang together to preserve quality for the System.

Mr. Tripp said the universities did not operate on an "open door" policy. He said the Boards of Trustees were effective. They understood their universities and this Board should rely on them.

Mr. Martin said the Board had made a decision, and could make a decision to change. He said the Governor had clearly changed his position about higher education. He said he was not afraid to change the policy, if the change were warranted. He said he concurred with Mr. Dasburg and Mr. Tripp.

Mrs. Roberts said she was concerned about large increases in enrollment. She said the Legislature had made it clear that it would not fund over-enrollment, and several of the universities still carried numbers of unfunded students.

Ms. Parker said she recognized the role of the Board to ensure quality. She said if the universities continued to enroll students without funding, this affected the quality of their education. She said it was difficult to hold the Legislature to its responsibility to provide proper funding. She said she had voted for the cap previously, but intended to vote differently because this was a different time. She said continuing the cap sent a message about limiting access to education. She said she preferred a message that offered an opportunity for a university education. Dr. Solano said students were being admitted, but not getting the classes they needed. Ms. Parker said she hoped the universities would figure out how to offer the needed classes.

Mr. Meyer commented that by adding students with fewer resources, the universities were offering fewer courses and it was difficult to graduate on time. He commented that the Governor proposed to spend additional tuition revenues on faculty and students, but not for university operations. He said the Legislature had not committed to additional university funding, and the universities might still see additional budget cuts this academic year. He said that increasing enrollment did not help students; crowded classrooms were not quality. He said he would maintain the policy.

Ms. Parker noted that there were 11 institutions. She said there might not be space at a student's first choice school, but there might be space elsewhere in the System. A student had options.

Ms. McDevitt said she was interested in hearing proposals from the universities. The Board still had a lot of work to figure out university funding and figure out a different way to fund General Revenue in the state, so the universities would not need to rely so heavily on per student funding. She said the Governor's idea of enhancing tuition was to enhance services for students, to provide a quality educational experience. She said that General Revenue contributed to the total funding package, and she did not believe the General Revenue picture would improve much in 2008 or 2009. She said that until the entire funding picture changed, she was not comfortable moving away from the previous Board position. She said the universities continued trailing unfunded enrollment; that should not happen. She said as the Board moved forward on several of the Forward by Design projects, and could achieve more predictability in funding, the policy might be re-considered.

Mr. Temple commented that the adoption of the cap brought attention to the funding constraints on the universities. He called the question on Ms. Pappas' motion. Members of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Dasburg said the Board should lift the cap, and leave enrollment decisions to the university boards. Ms. Pappas said the Board had adopted the cap as a philosophical decision relating to quality. She said nothing had changed for the Board to change that decision. She suggested the Board retain the cap until the funding model looked different. Mrs. Roberts agreed with Ms. Pappas.

Ms. Parker inquired about the timing of the decision. Chancellor Rosenberg said the universities were already making decisions for Summer 2009. He said he continued to be concerned about the underlying rationale for the cap, the preservation of System quality. He said the universities had committed to maintaining seats for community college transfers and some were already having difficulty with that policy. He said he was concerned about reducing access and about stagnating graduation rates. He said Board members should listen to the students' concerns.

Mr. Dasburg said the universities were not required to take any one course. He noted that universities structured their own budgets. He said this Board did not run the universities and should rely on the universities to structure their budgets and their enrollment plans. He said he viewed this as an operational matter for each university.

President Brogan sought clarification. He said he assumed that the cap remained in place because of the current economic circumstances. He said he assumed that the Board would have to address this issue again next year.

Dr. Marshall said in a perfect world he would oppose caps, but the problems leading to the policy might recur. He said he would be interested in the comments of the Presidents and Provosts.

President Maidique said it did not really matter what this Board decided. He noted that only one institution had asked for an exception. He said the universities could not afford to admit any more students. He said his Board of Trustees would retain the cap. He said the message was not always the same. By removing the cap, the public would read that the Board of Governors was opening up enrollment. He said it was not a question of substance, but that the timing was wrong to lift the cap.

President Brogan reported that FAU had gone slightly above the cap. He said that predicting enrollment was tricky because of the variations in the numbers of admitted students and the numbers of students actually enrolled. He suggested that the Board consider what would happen if the Governor's proposed legislation passed. He said the effect of any tuition increase would not be felt in the first semester. He noted that the universities had lost millions of dollars this year, with many services to students reduced and cut, such as advisers, counselors, and faculty members. He said the universities should first bring back what was eliminated through the cuts.

President Delaney said it seemed to be a philosophical matter. He said UNF was not growing, and had shrunk by 1100 students. He commented that some universities had space and needed to grow. He said the matter should be left at the local level, or if of great significance to the System, for the Board of Governors to decide. He said he had no intention of chasing enrollment growth at UNF.

Ms. Parker said she was concerned about adding unfunded students and then, coming back to the Board seeking funding for these students. Ms. McDevitt said that her concern was that the universities' enrollment plans were not taken seriously by the Legislature.

President Genshaft said that USF was not growing. She said the University would not take students it could not serve well.

President Ammons said that FAMU's goal was to grow into its funded enrollment. He said that even with the budget cuts, FAMU's first priority was to be sure that students had the courses they needed to stay on track for graduation. He said he understood the importance of quality and that he sought to ensure quality for FAMU students.

President Hitt said he trusted the Boards of Trustees and the Presidents to make the right choices. He said UCF grew approximately three percent and had improved its retention rate. He said he would not admit more students than there were classroom seats available.

President Bense said she was inclined to agree that enrollment should be left to the Boards of Trustees. She said, however, that the timing of this decision might damage the Governor's just-announced initiative. If the Board were to lift the cap, it would give the perception of watering down quality and raising enrollment. She said this would harm the initiative to raise tuition. She suggested waiting for the legislation to pass and then considering eliminating the cap.

President Bradshaw said that this issue underscored the wisdom of the local Boards of Trustees and letting them decide enrollment. He said that while some universities were shrinking, FGCU had a charge to grow. He said he would relieve the Chancellor of the responsibility to make exception decisions, and leave the decision with the Boards of Trustees and the Presidents.

Mr. Dasburg moved that the Board lift the enrollment caps currently in place. Mr. Tripp seconded the motion.

Dr. Marshall said this was difficult. He said he did not believe that any university would be hurt by this action, and the Board could later decide to reverse course. He added that the problem of funding was very serious.

The motion to lift the enrollment cap failed.

4. Review of Notes, October 30, 2008, Conference Call, Academic Programs Team

Mr. Martin said the agenda materials included notes from the October 30, 2008, Conference Call meeting of the Academic Programs Team. He said the Team had reviewed six new doctoral degree proposals and one doctoral program termination. Prior to the conference call, Team members had received copies of each degree proposal, staff analysis of each proposal, and any supporting materials provided by the universities. He said that each university was given five minutes to present its proposal. After the proposals were presented, he said Team members had discussed the proposals and had a spirited discussion with the university representatives. He said these discussions helped Team members understand the importance of these programs to their universities. He thanked Team members, Dr. Marshall and Mr. Temple, for their active participation.

5. Proposals for New Degree Programs

Mr. Martin said that in March 2007, the Board had revised its policies and procedures on new degree approval. He said the Board was now relying more on the role of the Boards of Trustees in the process and their implementation of policies aligned with BOG criteria and regulations. He said that included in the new Board

policy was a two-step process for the approval of new doctoral programs. He said that the University Boards had primary responsibility for ensuring academic quality and institutional readiness to implement the program. He said this Board would consider the sufficiency of the university proposal evaluation process, the distinctive mission of the university, alignment with the State University System Strategic Plan, and the extent to which the programs would contribute to the economic development of the local community and the state. He said the six proposals on the agenda were the first reviewed using this new process.

He said he would recognize a university representative for each program proposal to summarize the key reasons for wanting to implement the proposed programs. He said he would recommend hearing the three proposed programs from USF in a group.

A. Ph.D., Geosciences, FAU

Dean Gary Perry said the proposed Ph.D. in Geosciences was a new and unique program which would be a professionally driven Ph.D. program that would provide jobs and increase access to and production of degrees. He noted that the Department of Geosciences combined Geology and Geography. He said the program had few new costs associated with it as it took advantage of currently existing University resources, including a shift in emphasis from the existing masters program to the proposed Ph.D. He said he was concerned about losing young and talented faculty if the Ph.D. program were not implemented. He said the program had been favorably reviewed.

Mr. Temple said he was interested in the tuition for the program. Dean Perry said it would be the tuition charged in all other graduate programs. He estimated that at \$256 per credit, for 24 credit hours, the tuition cost would be \$6144. He also said 16 students would have Teaching Assistantships and 14 students would be supported by grants or research assistantships.

Mr. Perez moved that the Committee approve the proposed Ph.D., Geosciences, at FAU, CIP Code 40.0699, as presented. Mr. Dasburg seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

B. Doctor of Nursing Practice, (DNP), FSU

Dean Lisa Plowfield said the Doctor of Nursing Practice was not a program new to Florida. She said this degree was already offered at UF, UNF, UCF, USF and FAU; it would be the first DNP offered in northwest Florida. She noted that this clinical doctorate, the DNP, prepared highly qualified nurses with competencies in advanced practice nursing, and was

built upon the generalist foundation acquired through a baccalaureate in nursing or advanced generalist masters degree in nursing. She said the Advanced Practitioner Nurses graduating from the program were needed in this part of the state. She commented that the program had been developed in response to demand from working alumni and area healthcare providers. She said resources would be reallocated from the M.S. Advanced Practitioner program. She noted that even in a time of limited resources, there were still considerable nursing workforce needs which these graduates would help address.

Mr. Dasburg moved that the Committee approve the proposed Doctor of Nursing Practice, at FSU, CIP Code 51.1601, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

C. Ph.D., History; Ph.D., Government; and Ph.D., Sociology, USF

President Genshaft invited Dr. Ralph Wilcox, USF Provost, to describe the three proposed doctoral programs. Dr. Wilcox explained the three linked proposals in History, Government and Sociology. He said USF had a clear set of performance expectations for its research campus. He said these programs were a high priority for USF Tampa and were critical to fulfilling its strategic plan and Governor Crist's vision for achieving excellence in higher education. He commented that a key responsibility of USF Tampa's mission was to deliver high quality, relevant doctoral education across an array of disciplines, while promoting world class scholarship. He said these three Ph.D. programs were all offered at most national research universities.

Dr. Wilcox explained that the proposed curricula were quite different from traditional, discipline-based programs. They would be focused on institutional and statewide priorities of building sustainable healthy communities in a global context; students and professors would emphasize interdisciplinary inquiry and applied research. He said students would be prepared to deal with real world problems such as population growth, land use development, and the environment. The University, in the development of these programs, was working to align its resources with statewide priorities. He said that with careful planning, over time, USF had intentionally built an exceptional, world-class faculty, necessary to deliver these programs and dedicated to putting USF "on the map."

Dr. Wilcox said these programs were not high cost programs and would enhance student access and degree production. He said without these programs, the brightest students would leave the state. He said as the SUS, the community colleges, the state colleges and private

institutions provided access to more undergraduates, these institutions would need to hire faculty, so these programs would address significant workforce needs. He commented that the University of California campuses were the leading supplier of doctoral level professors to that state's colleges and community colleges. In addition, he explained how these programs would meet the needs of the community. He said USF's role in metropolitan outreach was very important. He said approval of the programs would represent a key component of USF's strategy to recruit and retain intellectual talent in Florida, to build excellence. He said this was also an effort to stem the departure of quality faculty who might be attracted to institutions offering the doctorate.

Mr. Tripp moved that the Committee approve the proposed Ph.D., History, at USF, CIP Code 54.0101, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion. Members of the Committee concurred, with Mr. Temple and Dr. Zachariah voting no.

Mr. Perez moved that the Committee approve the proposed Ph.D., Government, at USF, CIP Code 45.1001, as presented. Mr. Tripp seconded the motion. Members of the Committee concurred, with Mr. Temple and Dr. Zachariah voting no.

Mr. Perez moved that the Committee approve the proposed Ph.D., Sociology, at USF, CIP Code 45.1101, as presented. Mr. Dasburg seconded the motion. Members of the Committee concurred, with Mr. Temple and Dr. Zachariah voting no.

D. Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm. D.), USF

President Genshaft advised the Board that she recommended removing discussion of the proposed Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm. D.) from the agenda. She said there had been a number of questions about which the University needed to do further study.

Dr. Marshall said it was prudent of USF to withdraw the proposed Pharm. D. proposal. He said that when the Program Team had discussed this proposal, he had been convinced that Florida had a shortage of pharmacists. He also commented that the beginning wage for new pharmacists was approximately \$100,000. He said the Board needed to think seriously about this program; he encouraged USF to bring the proposal back to the Board for its consideration.

Mr. Temple said he continued to be concerned about tuition. He said Florida was not charging what it should for in-state pharmacy students. He said FAMU was charging tuition of about \$4000 for in-state

students, while private schools were charging their students about \$20,000. He suggested that the issue of tuition should be studied further.

Mr. Stavros agreed on the shortage of pharmacists in Florida. He said he believed every graduate could be hired by Wal-Mart, and more would still be needed. He said the state needed these types of professionals in its workforce.

6. Termination, Ph.D., Industrial and Systems Engineering, FIU

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Committee approve the proposed termination of the Ph.D., Industrial and Systems Engineering, at FIU, CIP Code 14.2701, as presented. Mr. Temple seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

7. Approval to Notice, Board of Governors Regulations: Revised BOG Regulation 6.017, Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree; Revised BOG Regulation 3.006, Accreditation; and Revised BOG Regulation 3.004, Honorary Degrees

Mr. Martin said the review of the Board's regulations continued. He said these regulations had been reviewed by the university general counsels, the Council of Academic Vice Presidents, and other state university academic contacts. He said the changes to the regulations were explained in the agenda materials.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Committee approve the notice of intent to amend Regulation 6.017, Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree; Regulation 3.006, Accreditation; and Revised BOG Regulation 3.004, Honorary Degrees; as presented, for publication on the Board's website, pursuant to the Board's regulation development procedure. Ms. Pappas seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m., November 20, 2008.

M. Lynn Pappas, Co-Chair

Frank T. Martin, Co-Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary