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**SD#1 Executive Summary.**

Strategic Direction # 1 focuses on student success and has eight interrelated recommendations to encourage and support student success. All relate to recruiting and retaining well prepared students: 1) align with K-12 student preparation, or college readiness; 2) implement degree program review based on student outcomes; 3) develop a shared set of general education objectives; 4) expand collaborative efforts for degree program and course delivery; 5) inventory and assess associate degree programs; 6) elaborate articulation and two-plus-two programs for transfer students; 7) advocate for and implement expanded financial aid to ensure access; and 8) develop a set of outcomes-oriented measures of success. Recommendations generally require existing System and institutional leadership resources and attention to appropriate shared governance for successful implementation, or, said another way, they require more in commitment to achievement in a reasonable and measurable time line than an infusion of new dollars. The significant exception is financial aid, which could be quite costly, but which has the potential to make all of the other recommendations work effectively toward increased student success across the University of Maine System.
### Strategic Direction - 1

**ACADEMIC QUALITY**

In this strategic direction, the focus is on improving academic quality across the System and supporting institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build effective K-12 and Maine Community College System—University of Maine System Alignment and Collaboration Strategies.</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build effective program review focused on student success outcomes</td>
<td>Low - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>BOT, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Presidents, CSAOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a shared set of general education objectives built on a process of consensus.</td>
<td>Medium - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>CAOs, Faculty Senates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures</td>
<td>High - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Medium - 2 million and above</td>
<td>High - Later</td>
<td>Medium - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>CAOs, Faculty Senates</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Human Resource Requirement</td>
<td>Financial Cost</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Complexity of Implementation</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Direction - 1</strong> ACADEMIC QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&gt; Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 Address associate degree program needs in the state through collaboration with the Maine Community College System</strong></td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - One time</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - One time</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $ 1 million and above</td>
<td>High - One time</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Build strong articulation programs for transfer students, including two-plus-two programs</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 Provide effective Financial Aid programs to support student success</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>BOT, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Presidents, CSAOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8 Develop accountability measures demonstrating student success with respect to Recommendations 1-7 within the context of the various institutional missions of UMS institutions</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SD#1 Investment Budget Analysis.**

**General Comment.** Most Strategic Direction #1 recommendations require the time and energy of existing System and institutional leadership, including the Board, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, the Presidents, the Chief Academic Officers, the Chief Student Affairs Officers, and Faculty Senates or other institutional means for exercising shared governance for developing and implementing recommendations. As a result, attaching an actual investment budget to most of these recommendations is impossible.

1.1. **Build effective K-12 and Maine Community College System—University of Maine System Alignment and Collaboration Strategies.** Requires existing leadership resources in collaboration with State-wide educational leadership.

1.2. **Build effective program review focused on student success outcomes.** Requires existing leadership resources. May require investment to increase program capacities for student success, including with respect to Strategic Direction # 4 recommendations.

1.3. **Develop a shared set of general education objectives built on a process of consensus.** Requires existing leadership resources. May require investment to enhance institutional general education programs.

1.4. **Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures.** Requires existing leadership resources. May require investment in distance education consistent with Strategic Direction # 3 recommendations.

1.5. **Address associate degree program needs in the state through collaboration with the Maine Community College System.** Requires existing leadership resources. May require additional resources with respect to associate degree program growth or conversion to baccalaureate programs.

1.6. **Build strong articulation programs for transfer students, including two-plus-two programs.** Requires existing leadership resources. May require additional investment funding as two-plus-two degree programs are developed and implemented.

1.7. **Provide effective Financial Aid programs to support student success.** Requires existing leadership resources. Most certainly will require significant additional funding for financial aid.

1.8. **Develop accountability measures demonstrating student success with respect to Recommendations 1.1-1.7 within the context of the various institutional missions of UMS institutions.** Requires existing leadership resources.
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the proportion of admitted students required to take developmental courses declined?

- Has the proportion of admitted students meeting recommendations for college success increased?

- Are admitted students demonstrating higher levels of college readiness relative to admission criteria?

- Has each institution adequately evaluated placement exams for effectiveness and, where appropriate, standardized and normed them?

- Have collaborations for working to align institutional expectations with K-12 and MCCS preparation developed?

- Has the proportion of admitted students required to take developmental courses declined?

- Has the proportion of admitted students meeting recommendations for college success increased?

### Strategic Direction 1
#### Academic Quality

1.2 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- **Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.**

- **Recommendation**

  - 1.2. Build effective program review focused on student success outcomes.

---

#### Performance Metric Questions

- Has the BOT approved recommended modifications to Program Review requirements relative to enhancing student success?

- Has each institution developed and implemented through shared governance a program review process directed to student success and consistent with the BOT Program Review requirements?

- Has the number of institutional programs reviewed each year for student success consistent with the BOT Program Review requirements increased?

- Has program review led to demonstrable improvement on programs leading to enhanced student success?
1.3 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality

1.3 Develop a shared set of general education objectives built on a process of consensus.

Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

Performance Metric Questions

► Have CAOs developed in consultation with their respective Faculty Senates a set of shared general education outcomes?

► Has each institution implemented the set of shared general education outcomes?

► Has each institution reviewed the effectiveness of its general education relative to the set of shared general education outcomes relative to student success?

Recommendation
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.4 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

Recommendation

1.4. Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures.

Performance Metric Questions

► Are mechanisms in place to encourage and support faculty collaboration for developing program and course delivery structures among multiple institutions.

► Do program proposal and review processes address design for collaborative delivery of programs and courses?

► Does the System inventory collaborative program and course delivery structures?

► Has the number of students taking and completing collaborative programs and courses increased?
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.5 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

1.5. Address associate degree program needs in the state through collaboration with the Maine Community College System.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Has each institution inventoried and determined the regional need for continuing associate degree programs in collaboration with appropriate community colleges?

- Has each institution developed a plan for suspension and elimination of associate degree programs, continuation of existing programs, or development of new programs, consistent with demonstrated regional need?

- Has the BOT approved institutional plans for meeting regional needs for associate degree programs?
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.6 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

1.6: Build strong articulation programs for transfer students, including two-plus-two programs.

Performance Metric Questions

- Have institutions removed any non-academically necessary impediments to smooth articulation for transfer students?
- Has the number of transfer students increased consistent with program planning and institutional missions?
- Have institutions developed two-plus-two degree programs consistent with an inventory of regional needs and responsive to articulation requirements?
1.7. Provide effective Financial Aid programs to support student success.

**Strategic Direction 1**

**Academic Quality**

1.7 **ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE**

Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Has the System been able to increase the amount of financial aid dollars available across the System and from all sources and for both need and merit?
- Have financial aid allocation strategies led to an increase and increased retention in the number of eligible students enrolled in each institution?
- Have financial aid strategies led to an increase in net tuition revenue at each institution?

**Recommendation**
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.8 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in advancing their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

1.8. Develop accountability measures demonstrating student success with respect to Recommendations 1.1-1.7 within the context of the various institutional missions of UMS institutions.

Performance Metric Questions

- Are post-graduation surveys in place and operational to assess the quality and effectiveness of institutional programs?
- Are Strategic Direction # 1 recommendations deemed consistent with Strategic Direction # 6 recommendations on accountability and consistent with approved core values, when BOT approves Strategic Direction # 6 recommendations?
- Are performance measures in place and operational for Strategic Direction # 1 recommendations 1.1 through 1.7, as demonstrated by a sample audit across all recommendations and all System institutions?
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
Final Report
SD#1 Summary Comments.

Strategic Direction # 1 deals with student success. Measures of success are not easy to develop and operationalize, and success in doing so will require concerted leadership at all levels as well as a high level of involvement of all parties responsible for shared governance. It is incumbent on the Board and the Chancellor to respect institutional shared governance as implementation proceeds with each of the Strategic Direction # 1 recommendations.
Strategic Direction 2 – Faculty and Staff Development

Executive Summary

The previous SD 2 reports and the Final Recommendations Grid, items 2.2 through 2.13, lay out a program for enhanced faculty/staff development and productivity. While the budget requirements are projected to be relatively modest, organizational demands would be significant, but returns could be high.

The most important recommendation, however, is item 2.1, that faculty and staff salaries be brought to competitive levels. While there can be discussion about what the comparison groups and benchmarks should be, there should be consensus about the urgent need to address compensation. This is a key requirement for the long-term health of the System and for its continued ability to serve the state of Maine. We recognize that resources are tight, but progress must be made on this topic. All the System goals depend on the faculty and staff to carry them out, and a competitive compensation plan is the key to good morale and engagement with the many tasks this planning process has envisioned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine Compensation Goals</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High - $1 million</td>
<td>2 Medium-2008-2011</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>BOT Chancellor, Pres., VC, HR</td>
<td>2 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Criteria and Implementation for Faculty Review</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>1 Medium-2008-2011</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>VC, Provosts, Presidents, Faculty</td>
<td>1 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set targets for endowed professorships and endowed chairs</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>2 Low-2007</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Chancellor, Provost</td>
<td>2 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appropriate staff to support faculty to enable them to increase productivity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High - $1 million</td>
<td>2 Medium-2008-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>VC, Provosts, Presidents, Faculty</td>
<td>2 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make offerings from faculty development centers at UM, USM and other campuses open to all faculty.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-$250 - $1 million</td>
<td>2 Low-2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Presidents, Provosts, Faculty</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use PolyCom and other media for conferences, collaboration, workshops, information-sharing. Costs here would involve staff time to publicize and coordinate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>2 Low-2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>VC, Distance Ed. Director</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create searchable Web-based directory of UMS faculty and their scholarly/pedagogical interests.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-$250 - $1 million</td>
<td>2 Medium-2008-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System support of academic conferences to encourage cross-campus collaboration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-$250 - $1 million</td>
<td>2 Medium-2008-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

- Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)
- Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)
- High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)
- Time Element:
  1. One time
  2. Ongoing

- Financial Cost:
  - High - $1 million
  - Low - Less than $250,000
  - Medium - $250,000 to $1 million
- Time Frame:
  - Low - 2007
  - Medium - 2008-2011
  - High - 2012 and later
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support established faculty staff groups to meet</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low 2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target introductory courses for development activities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium $250 - $1 million</td>
<td>Low 2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Provosts</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus tour of state for all new faculty</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium $250 - $1 million</td>
<td>Low 2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When faculty go on sabbatical or participate in projects like Project Maine-France, fill in with courses from other campuses via other modalities, if department lacks replacement coverage.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium $250 - $1 million</td>
<td>Medium 2008-2011</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Provost, Faculty</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase Trustee Professors by arranging visits to other campuses, use visiting Libra Professors to go to more than one campus</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low 2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Presidents, Provosts</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty's ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty's ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.1 Refine Compensation Goals

Performance Metric Questions

► What are the benchmarks for comparison institutions?
► What are the target ranges for faculty ranks/staff position?
► What is the budget?
► Have funding sources been identified and a strategy to secure funding sources created?
► Have funding sources been secured?

Assessment: Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Presidents, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources Director
Assessment: Presidents, Vice Chancellor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Have the provosts and faculty on each campus reviewed criteria and procedures in light of campus mission and goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Have changes been decided upon through a governance process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2 Criteria and Implementation for Faculty Review**

**Recommendation**

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.
Assessment: Chancellor

Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.3 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

► Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.3 Target Endowed Professorships/Chairs

Performance Metric Questions

► Have presidents reviewed development plans in light of campus missions and areas of potential interest to donors?

►

►

►

►

►

►

Assessment: Chancellor
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.4 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.4 Provide appropriate staff to support faculty to enable them to increase their productivity

Performance Metric Questions

► Have the Vice Chancellor and Provosts decided upon which staff should be provided and whether those staff should be campus-based or cross-campus support?

► Has a timeline and budget been developed?

Assessment: Presidents, Vice Chancellor
Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty's ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.5 Make Faculty Development Center offerings at UM and USM available to System faculty.

Performance Metric Questions

- Have centers reviewed offerings to determine which have capacity?
- Have those offerings been publicized to the University of Maine System faculty?
- Have campus provosts assessed need and asked centers what programs they can provide?
- Have centers developed budgets?

Assessment: Provosts, Vice Chancellor
Assessment: Vice Chancellor

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the Vice Chancellor determined system capacity, timetable and topics?
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.7 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.7 Create searchable Web-based directory of UMS faculty and their scholarly/pedagogical interests.

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the Vice Chancellor determined the staff and resources that would be necessary to create the database?

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.8 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.8 System support of academic conferences to encourage cross-campus collaboration

Performance Metric Questions

► Have the Vice Chancellor and Provosts determined target areas and topics for these conferences?

► Has a budget a timetable been developed?

Recommendation

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
### Strategic Direction 2
**Faculty and Staff Development**

#### 2.9 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the Vice Chancellor and Provosts determined which such groups exist on campuses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a budget and timetable been set?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

2.9 Support established faculty staff groups to meet

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
### Strategic Direction 2
**Faculty and Staff Development**

#### 2.10 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

_Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff._

**Recommendation**

2.10 Target introductory courses for development activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Have the Vice Chancellor and Provosts developed a list of target courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Has a budget and timetable been developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Has a pilot program (if needed) been created?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
Assessment: Vice Chancellor

Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.11 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.11 Bus tour of state for all new faculty

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the Vice Chancellor determined whether there is a budget for this?
- If budget is available, has a draft itinerary and program been developed?
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.12 When faculty go on sabbatical or participate in projects like Project Maine-France, fill in with courses from other campuses via other modalities, if department lacks replacement coverage.

Performance Metric Questions

- Have the Vice Chancellor and Provosts determined needs and indentified modalities?

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
Strategic Direction 2
Faculty and Staff Development
2.13 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Ensure a high-quality and well-supported faculty throughout the System, with strong faculty development programs to enhance faculty’s ability to contribute to the excellence of academic programs and research, while providing appropriate levels of support for staff.

2.13 Showcase Trustee Professors by arranging visits to other campuses, use visiting Libra Professors to go to more than one campus

Performance Metric Questions

- Have the Vice Chancellor and the Provosts determined who is serving in these roles and what their availability would be to make more visits?

Recommendation

Assessment: Vice Chancellor
Strategic Direction 3

*Distance Education*

Final Report
# Strategic Direction - 3
## DISTANCE EDUCATION

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological strengths, and further coordinating program offerings and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>- Little employee investment (1-10)</td>
<td>- Less than $250,000</td>
<td>- Low</td>
<td>- Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>- Moderate employee investment (10-25)</td>
<td>- $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>- Medium</td>
<td>- Chancellor and multi-campus administration</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>- Significant employee investment (More than 25)</td>
<td>- $1 million and above</td>
<td>- High</td>
<td>- Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1 ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

- **a** The UMS will provide a robust slate of high quality undergraduate, graduate, and certificate programs that are responsive to identified needs and fully available through distance education.
  - **High**
  - **2**
  - **Low**
  - **2**
  - **Medium**
  - **2**
  - **Medium**
  - **LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's**
  - **1**

- **b** New program development will be encouraged by an additional annual University College budget allocation of not less than $100,000.
  - **Medium**
  - **2**
  - **Low**
  - **2**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Medium**
  - **LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's**

### 3.2 DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY COUNCIL (DLAC)

- **a** The DLAC will be established to foster greater communication, collaboration, efficiency, and effectiveness in the development and delivery of distance education.
  - **Medium**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Medium**
  - **LeGore, Nuñez**

- **b** During year one, the DLAC will find a name for the UMS multi-campus distance education program, including University College itself, that can be used to effectively market the program's high quality, broad access, and affordability.
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **LeGore, Nuñez**

- **c** During year one, the DLAC will define and support a UMS-wide policy that will encourage all faculty teaching courses delivered at least 85% online, for the first time, to participate in UC's online mini-course, or equivalent experiences.  UC will be encouraged to prepare them to teach online. UC will be encouraged to coordinate a variety of faculty training initiatives statewide.
  - **Medium**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Medium**
  - **LeGore, Nuñez, CAO's**

- **d** On an ongoing basis, the DLAC will work with the UMS Director of Distance Education to enhance their learning about best practices in distance education, and will advise and support the Director in continuously improving the delivery of University College's and system-wide services to distance learners, faculty, and staff.
  - **Medium**
  - **2**
  - **Low**
  - **2**
  - **Low**
  - **1**
  - **Medium**
  - **LeGore**
## Strategic Direction 3

**DISTANCE EDUCATION**

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological strengths, and further coordinating program offerings and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On an ongoing basis, the DLAC will advocate for academic policies and procedures that are responsive to the realities of learning at a distance, and that do not hinder or disadvantage distance education students.</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10) Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25) High - Significant employee investment (More than 25)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000 Medium - $250,000 to $1 million High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>Low - One time High - 2 years Medium - 2007-2011 Low - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CFO's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The viability of each UC center and site will be assessed annually using standardized, consistent rubrics.</td>
<td>Low - One time High - 2 years Low - One time</td>
<td>Low - 2007 Medium - 2008-2011 Low - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - One time Medium - 2007, 2008-2011 High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CFO's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education tuition will be fair, competitive, and based on a stable, accountable financial framework.</td>
<td>Low - One time Medium - 2007, 2008-2011 High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - One time Medium - 2007, 2008-2011 High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - One time Medium - 2007, 2008-2011 High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration</td>
<td>LeGore, Nuñez, CFO's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Final Report - Strategic Direction 3

**Final Report - Strategic Direction 3**

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

- The UMS will address the benefits, limitations, and cost effectiveness of current technologies, while also evolving to new technologies that better support the goals of the universities' distance programs.
- The viability of each UC center and site will be assessed annually using standardized, consistent rubrics.
- Distance education tuition will be fair, competitive, and based on a stable, accountable financial framework.
- Distance education faculty compensation will be fair, competitive, and based on a stable, accountable financial framework.
### Final Report - Strategic Direction 3

**DISTANCE EDUCATION**

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological strengths, and further coordinating program offerings and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 ADVOCACY for Non-UMS BROADBAND ACCESS</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10) Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25) High - Significant employee investment (More than 25)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000 Medium - $250,000 to $1 million High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>Low - 2007 Medium - 2008-2011 High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential</td>
<td>LeGore, Caruso, Poulin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 3.1 Academic Program Development

One-time Costs at System Level
Michael Thomas at NEBHE will have completed studies of two counties by this summer. His work should be expanded to include the remaining counties or, at a minimum, counties, or parts of counties, where University College Centers are trying to meet the needs of place-bound students in more remote areas of the state (Androscoggin, Aroostook, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Waldo). **Estimated cost: $40,000.**

On-going Costs at System Level
Although the initial **$100,000** for program development incentives can be funded from one-time University College reserves, on-going funding of initiatives will need base budget funding to continue.

One-time and/or on-going Costs at the University Level
Universities that aren’t competitive for system-level funding, or for which system-level funding is inadequate, may need to devote a portion of their budget to program development while waiting for return on investment in the form of new tuition revenue.

As the number of online courses increases, the number of faculty participating in the UMS Mini-Course for Online Faculty will grow. Campuses providing incentives for course enrollment and course planning will need to budget accordingly. This spring, more than thirty-five faculty are participating in the mini-course. If each university recruits 10 faculty to teach via distance education each year, this would total at least **$10,000** per university campus per year.

Recommendation 3.2 Distance Learning Advisory Council (DLAC)

**One-time Costs at System Level**
For **$9,000** the UMS Office of External Affairs will use the services of one of its proven consultants to conduct focus groups to test various naming conventions for the UMS distance education effort, including the University College Outreach Centers. The UMS must be careful to preserve the marketability and visibility of the Centers while enhancing the overall image of distance education in Maine.

**On-going Costs at the System Level**
For the Distance Learning Advisory Council to stay current in distance education affairs, a fund of **$10,000** should be made available to encourage at least two council members, as a team, to participate in appropriate distance education conferences each year.

At this time, system-level peer learning activities are restricted to the annual Faculty Institute in May and the online mini-course for first-time online faculty. Additional peer learning opportunities could include guest speakers from exceptional programs, satellite downlinks, etc. An additional **$5,000** per year would greatly enhance peer learning.

**On-going Costs at the University Level**
While the UMS maintains a membership in WCET, individual universities would be wise to invest in university-level memberships at from $500 to $1800 per year. Memberships in NUTN may also be appropriate ($500 per year) as well as Sloan-C (no cost).

**Recommendation 3.3 Accountability**

**On-going Costs at the System Level**

$20,000 may be required to provide stipends or salary increases to appropriate professional staff at University College in recognition of increased statewide responsibility for supporting new program development, oversight of the DLAC and increased reporting demands.

**On-going Costs at the University Level**

*Fair, competitive faculty compensation based on a stable, accountable financial framework* may require additional funds at the University level. Hopefully these funds would come from tuition revenue generated from expanded programs.
Strategy Direction 3
Distance Education
3.1.b ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

- Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

Performance Metric Questions

- Has $100,000 been added to the University College budget for this purpose?
- Are universities applying for the $100,000 funding in order to develop new distance education programs?
- Are funds recycled in a timely fashion (rather than being tied up for extended periods of time at a single school and/or for a single program)?
- Are new programs actually being created and offered as a result of the $100,000?
- Are the newly generated programs critical to the needs of the state?
Strategic Direction 3
Distance Education
3.2.a ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

- Has a DLAC been established?
- Does it include adequately broad representation?
- Is the DLAC operating in a cohesive, sustainable, regular fashion?
- Is the DLAC operating as a credible advocate for distance education within the UMS — on the individual campuses, at the UC centers, and at the UMS System Office?

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY COUNCIL — The DLAC will be established to foster greater communication, collaboration, efficiency, and effectiveness in the development and delivery of distance education.
Strategic Direction 3
Distance Education
3.2.b ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY COUNCIL — During year one, the DLAC will find a name for the UMS multi-campus distance education program, including University College itself, that can be used to effectively market the program's high quality, broad access, and affordability.

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

► Has a process been established to identify and hire appropriate consultants and conduct market research?

► Has a process been established that involves sufficient collaboration and feedback loops among the broad range of constituents involved — University College, the seven universities, the System Office, UMS students, etc.?

► Is sufficient funding in place to pay for the marketing necessary to create a brand around the new name?

► Under this new brand identity, has UMS distance education become an integrated, holistic, comprehensive and collaborative system fully embraced by each of the campuses and the organization formerly known as University College?
Is the effectiveness of these faculty training initiatives being assessed on a regular, systematic basis?

Has the DLAC defined and advocated for UMS adoption of a policy that encourages professional development for faculty teaching—or interested in teaching—distance education?

Performance Metric Questions

► Is the mini-course being taught on a regular rotation and reaching faculty System-wide?

► Is University College coordinating a variety of faculty training initiatives statewide?

► Is the effectiveness of these faculty training initiatives being assessed on a regular, systematic basis?

Has the DLAC defined and advocated for UMS adoption of a policy that encourages professional development for faculty teaching—or interested in teaching—distance education?
Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program; leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

**DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY COUNCIL** — On an ongoing basis, the DLAC will work with the UMS Director of Distance Education to enhance their learning about best practices in distance education, and will advise and support the Director in continuously improving the delivery of University College's and system-wide services to distance learners, faculty and staff.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Are ample opportunities provided by the UMS Director of Distance Education, and University College staff, for DLAC members to learn more about distance education best practices?
- Is a significant portion of the council’s overall meeting time devoted to learning about, reflecting upon, and suggesting improvements to University College services?
- Is a significant portion of the council’s overall meeting time devoted to learning about, reflecting upon, and suggesting improvements to system-wide services and policies (e.g., PeopleSoft systems, academic policies) that impact distant learners and multi-campus students?
- At the system level, when necessary, has the DLAC advocated for support of key University College services and activities, and for distance students, in general?
- At the university level, when necessary, have individual members of the DLAC advocated for support for University College services and activities, and for distance students, in general?
Are the Chief Academic Officers meeting periodically—perhaps annually—to discuss issues and opportunities with representatives of the Distance Learning Advisory Council?

**DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY COUNCIL** — On an ongoing basis, the DLAC will advocate for academic policies and procedures that are responsive to the realities of learning at a distance, and that do not hinder or disadvantage distance education students.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Is UMS distance education taking full advantage of the potential and opportunities made available by the implementation of PeopleSoft?
- Have specific problem and opportunity areas been articulated, policies drafted and suggested to the Chief Academic Officer?
- Are the Chief Academic Officers meeting periodically—perhaps annually—to discuss issues and opportunities with representatives of the Distance Learning Advisory Council?

**Recommendation**

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.
Strategic Direction 3
Distance Education
3.3.a ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

Accountability — The UAS will address the benefits, limitations, and cost effectiveness of current technologies, while also evolving to new technologies that better support the goals of the universities' distance programs.

Performance Metric Questions

► What is the total cost of each delivery system? What is the number of enrollments and/or customers for each delivery system? What is the cost per student enrolled or per customer use for each delivery system?

► What are the significant enrollment trends for the past year, and what are their implications for technology planning?

► Survey students every two or three years to determine student satisfaction with the various technologies.

►
Strategic Direction 3
Distance Education
3.3.b ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

**Recommendation**

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

**ACCOUNTABILITY** — The viability of each UC center and site will be assessed annually using standardized, consistent rubrics.

### Performance Metric Questions

- Have the five standard, consistent rubrics been applied annually to each center and site?

- Have the rubrics been examined for the purpose of evaluating the long-term viability of each center and site?
What are the enrollment trends for the various UMS programs by delivery mode, both in-state and out-of-state? Do the data suggest any correlation to tuition and fee rates?

Performance Metric Questions

- Have benchmarking peers been identified for the various programs being offered at a distance? Are tuition and fee rates being tracked, over time, for these benchmark peers?
- How do Maine programs compare to the benchmark rates? Are they fair and competitive?
- What are the enrollment trends for the various UMS programs by delivery mode, both in-state and out-of-state? Do the data suggest any correlation to tuition and fee rates?
Within the past two years, has information about current compensation models in Maine been distributed to interested parties for their review?

Within the past two years, has information about current compensation models across the country been distributed to interested parties for their review?

ACCOUNTABILITY — Distance education faculty compensation will be fair, competitive, and based on a stable, accountable financial framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➤ How many faculty are developing new distance courses for the first time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ How many faculty are continuing to teach at a distance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Within the past two years, has information about current compensation models in Maine been distributed to interested parties for their review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Within the past two years, has information about current compensation models across the country been distributed to interested parties for their review?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Direction 3
Distance Education
3.4.a ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program, leveraging current technological coordinating program offerings and development.

ADVOCACY for Non-UMS BROADBAND ACCESS - The UMS will encourage and help facilitate external efforts to expand student access to broadband connectivity, statewide, to support student access to distance education programs.

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the University of Maine System been represented at all major discussions relating to broadband access in Maine?

- What percentage of Maine citizens do not have access to reasonably-priced broadband internet service due to geographic limitations? How is this number changing over time?
Strategic Direction 4

Libraries

Final Report
Strategic Direction #4 Working Group  
Enhancing University of Maine System Libraries

April 25, 2006

Dr. Elsa Nunez, Vice Chancellor  
Academic and Student Affairs  
University of Maine System  
10 Central Street  
Bangor, Maine 04401

Dear Elsa,

I am pleased to submit the final product of almost two year’s work by our SD#4 Working Group for consideration by you and the Board of Trustees. Copies of SD#4’s Final Report are enclosed for your use. Should you have questions, please contact me, or Joyce Rumery.

The Report’s format follows your guidelines with section headings:
- Executive Summary
- Final one-page Report Grid/Chart with Recommendations, Ratings, Costs and Priorities
- Budget Detail and Campus Assessment Funding Formula
- Assessment Templates for each of the Recommendations
- Summary Narrative – including explanatory excerpts from earlier drafts

I am very proud of the work of our group, and extremely honored to have been able to lead such a hard-working and selfless team of professionals. While the UMS Library Directors did much of the heavy lifting, we were also blessed with expertise, advice and support from a number of UMS faculty and staff members also on our team. I do want to single out Dr. Bob Rice, Professor Wood Science from Orono for his leadership, research and mastery of the base-budget funding formula. He deserves special recognition for his work and ongoing support for the value of libraries in academe.

Thank you and your able staff for your continuing support through this process. I will be in Savannah until Sunday the 30th but can be reached on my cell phone 207.458.4111 should you need to contact me before I return. I look forward to the meeting with the sub-committee next week.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas E. Abbott, PhD, Co-Chair SD#4  
Dean of Libraries & Instructional Support UMA

Copy; Dr. Rachel Albert  
SD #4 Members
STRATEGIC DIRECTION #4: ENHANCING LIBRARY RESOURCES

Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a statewide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

Executive Summary

The University of Maine System libraries extensive history of collaboration is best exemplified by our shared nationally recognized online catalog URSUS, (almost 15 years old) which includes the collections of eight libraries of the University of Maine System, the Maine State Library, the State Law and Legislative Reference Library and the Bangor Public Library, and Maine Info Net, the statewide catalog which links all Maine libraries. A unique partnership exists between the UMS libraries and the Maine State Library facilitating statewide access to electronic indexes and databases, ensuring that all Maine libraries and citizens have access to all library resources.

Understanding the library’s primary role
The UMS libraries are both virtual and physical spaces, as well as social and learning centers for their respective campus and public communities. The library’s primary role on each campus is to educate users by collaborating with faculty to promote information literacy and critical thinking, provide resources for research, and to evaluate these outcomes through assessment. Each library is a unique expression of the cultural heritage and characteristics of the place in which it is located. Individually and as a consortium, the libraries confront the realities of budgetary constraints and challenges posed by the transition from print to electronic publishing.

Stabilizing the partnership of libraries statewide: Creating the Maine Info Net organization
The UMS Libraries and the Maine State Library have begun to implement the major directions proposed by the NELINET Consulting Solutions in their July 2003 Report with the hiring of a CEO for Maine InfoNet. His initial and primary duty is to advance the growth, awareness and support for Maine Info Net as a gateway for library services across Maine.

Continuing the UMS collaboration and seeking new partnerships
The UMS Libraries will further develop their historic partnership into a more structured and formal commitment to collaborative collection development, information technology services, information literacy, staff development, and technical operations. Fogler Library at the University of Maine in Orono will be formally recognized and supported as the lead System and State research library and support the research needs of students and faculty at all campuses.

Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library - the UMS Libraries URSUS budget
• The future success of the University of Maine System Libraries depends on continued growth and development of the statewide digital library given the rapid shift to digital content. Rather than depending on cobbled together funding at every step, a rational funding formula tied to credit hours generated and degree levels by campus is strongly recommended as a means of ongoing shared responsibility for
maintaining a strong digitally-based UMS library system. The funding formula includes inflationary indexing and required additions to the budget when new programs are approved. The budgeting formula does not include capital equipment. The initial funding estimate is based on historical data.

(See charts for formula and assessment detail)

- Current Base Budget: $290,445
- HEPI inflation factor: $ 3,851 (3.5%)
- Digital Initiative: $ 25,000
  **Sub-Total $319,296**

- Databases $204,023
- ARL inflation factor $ 20,402 (10%)
- Digital Initiative $ 25,000
  **Sub-Total $249,425 (from cost-sharing formula assessment to campuses)**

**Grand Total $568,721**

- New Program Fund* $250,000 annual estimate (Initiated by campus originating new program)
- **Estimated Annual Total with New Program Fund Resources included: $818,721**

Sources: Current base budget, inflationary increase, Digital Initiative from UMS, plus $249,425 funded with new cost-sharing formula from campuses based on credit hours and level of programs offered, i.e., graduate program library costs are higher than undergraduate degree programs.

*New Program Fund based on library needs for new program startup is provided by campus offering new programs and may shared by other campuses where resources will be used by their students and faculty.

A single well-funded research library to benefit the System requires an increase in Fogler Library’s base budget

In order for Fogler Library to expand and solidify its role as University of Maine System leader in the development of research collections and establishment of expanded digital collections, Fogler needs an updated facility and adequate support for collections and staff to realize this core goal of SD#4:

- **Research collections:** an increase of $1 million each year for five ($5,000,000 base then indexed to inflation)
  Percentage shares of UMS research grants and bonds should also be considered as a means building the collection.
- **Library staffing to meet UM and System research needs:** $560,418
  2 public services, 3 technical services staff, 4 support staff, 2 FTE student staff
- **Funding for new Fogler Library physical addition:** $26,000,000
  Build 95,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs (addition only, no renovation)
## Recommendations

**NB:** THESE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE CHANGED FROM EARLIER VERSIONS - PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY: thank you

| Strategic Direction - 4 | LIBRARIES |

**4.1 Implement a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state.**

**Low 1**

Within current budget

**1**

Low

**1**

Low

Chancellor’s Staff

**READY NOW**

**4.2 Enhance and Strengthen the effectiveness of the UMS Library Consortium.**

**Medium 2**

No additional costs - potential future cost containment

**2**

Start in 2007 -- then ongoing ------

**1 & 2**

Some Low & Some High

Library Directors

**FOUR**

**4.3 Develop a well-funded research library at the University of Maine.**

A: New Staffing  
B: New Research Collections  
C: New Building

**A: Staffing High B: Collections Medium C: Building Medium**

**1**

A: $500,418  
B: $5 Million  
C: $20 Million

**2**

A: Low  
B: Medium  
C: High

**1**

Low, Low, High

Chancellor, Presidents, UMS CFOs, Legislature

**TWO**

**4.4 Expand the statewide integrated digital library through increased collaboration between the UMS Library consortium and the Maine State Library using Maine Info Net as a model (See 2003 Maine InfoNet Report).**

**Medium 2**

Cost of UMS share of CEO Maine Info Net

**2**

Low

**1**

Medium

Library Directors, State Librarian, Maine Library Commission, Maine InfoNet Board

**THREE**

**4.5 Based on a new funding formula (presented within) establish a permanent base-budget investment in UMS digital library resources and investments.**

**Low 1**

Annually, $319,296-current budget+$249,425-Campus Assess +$300,000 for New Pgm Fnd

**2**

Low

**1**

Medium

Chancellor, Presidents, UMS CFOs, Legislature

**ONE**

**Note on priority TWO** - Resource and time demands vary by each required component, but all three parts (A, B & C) are required to create the Research Library at UMS.

---

**Human Resource Requirement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-5 employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (6-25 employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low - One time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Two &amp; On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complexity of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, UMS CFOs, Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Directors, State Librarian, Maine Library Commission, Maine InfoNet Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, UMS CFOs, Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Report - Budget Summary and Funding Formula
Revised 5/08/06

STRATEGIC DIRECTION #4: ENHANCING LIBRARY RESOURCES

Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a statewide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

Budget Summary and Funding Formula:

Priority 1
Goal 4.5 Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library - the UMS Libraries URSUS budget

The future success of the University of Maine System Libraries depends on continued growth and development of the statewide digital library. Rather than depending on cobbled together funding at every step, a rational funding formula tied to credit hours generated and degree levels by campus is strongly recommended as a means of ongoing shared responsibility for maintaining a strong digitally-based UMS library system. The funding formula includes inflationary indexing and required additions to the budget by the campus initiating new programs. The budgeting formula does not include capital equipment. The initial funding estimate for the annual URSUS (Digital Library) operating budget is:

- Current Base Budget: $290,445
- HEPI inflation factor: $3,851 (3.5%)
- Digital Initiative: $25,000
  **Sub-Total** $319,296
- Databases $204,023
- ARL inflation factor $20,402
- Digital Initiative $25,000
  **Sub-Total** $249,425 (from cost-sharing formula assessment to campuses)

**Grand Total** $568,721

- New Program Fund* $250,000 annual estimate (Initiated by campus originating new program)
- Estimated Annual Total with New Program Fund Resources included: $818,721

*Note: Major 5/08/06 revision removed new program fund from formula as originally intended

Sources: Current base budget, inflationary increase, Digital Initiative from UMS, plus $249,425 funded with new cost-sharing formula from campuses based on credit hours and level of programs offered, i.e., graduate program library costs are higher than undergraduate degree programs.

*New Program Fund based on library needs for new program startup is provided by campus initiating the new programs and may shared by other campuses where resources will be used by their students and faculty.
**Funding Formula:**
The URSUS/Digital Library annual operating budget outlined below is based on a proposed **funding formula** (modeled after those in other states), and as stated in the original goals, is intended to stabilize support for the centralized services covered by the URSUS digital library budget. Equally important, it is intended to be responsive to the ongoing development and growth of the digital library shared by all Maine’s citizens. Two inflation indexes have been proposed and are applied to software costs (HEPI) and Databases (ARL). The formula balances library **demands from campus users by type and level of academic program offered**.

**New Program Fund:**
For the first time in UMS history a **“New Program Factor”** requires startup funding from the initiating campus when new programs are approved. Ongoing licensing and new purchase costs are responsibility of the initiating campus – with some potential for voluntary cost sharing. Library expenses related to new programs may be shared with other campuses where needs are identified. EXAMPLE: Should UM decide to purchase library resources for the proposed biomedical graduate program, those same resources would no doubt be valuable for other campus biology, nursing, and related programs. If other campus determine they are interested in use of these resources, costs of the initial purchase and/or ongoing licensing should be shared.

**Capital Equipment:**
The budget does not however provide for capital equipment acquisition or replacement

**Digital Initiative Fund:**
In an effort to move beyond maintenance of services and systems (at current levels), the formula also includes a modest increase of $50,000 annually to support startup and testing of digital initiatives. This **“initiative fund”** is apportioned in the budget equally to the base UMS funding and the campus assessments. Once a high priority digital initiative has been tested and readied for Maine’s statewide digital library, separate internal or external funding will be required to proceed.

**NOTE on Fogler Library costs:** The budget formula below does not address the costs in 4.3 associated with upgrading Fogler Library’ budget and facility to the level of a moderate to strong research library center.

**FUNDING FORMULA NOTES:**
Introduction and Budget Notes developed by Professor Robert Rice and his colleagues on the SD #4Team:

Funding formulae are commonly applied to fund auxiliary services such as libraries. The formula developed below is a slightly modified version of one of the most common formulas in use nationally. The approach is straightforward and is **based on the number of student credit hours taught at each campus by academic level of student – reflecting varying levels of library demand:**

- Each campus is assessed a certain amount to pay for Systemwide library services.
- The assessment levied varies by the mission of the campus and the number of student credit hours taught by the campus – less 27 – 20% exception for non-users (See next bullet).
- In most cases, twenty-seven percent of the student credit hours are exempt from assessment because not all academic programs use the library services and resources at the same level. For credit hours in law or doctoral programs, the exemption is twenty percent.
- Base funding in three categories is provided by UMS as has been the case since the inception of the URSUS Budget for System-wide library services.
- Two inflation factors are used in the example below. The Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) factor is a widely used index and is applied to certain software packages with traditionally low inflation rates (code 542, below). The HEPI index factor is 3.5% in the example below. The electronic databases are inflated using the nationally recognized Association of Research Library (ARL) rate. The rate in the example below is 10% as specified by ARL for 2005.
- The initial funding estimate is based on historical data.
- Fall 2005 student credit hours used.
- Annual assessments are based on Fall Semester credit hour enrollments

### Annual URSUS/Digital Library Base Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula Element</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated Need.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base 100</td>
<td>Non Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$66,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 190</td>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$35,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 200</td>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 300</td>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 400</td>
<td>UNET</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 401</td>
<td>- Programming Consultant</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 410</td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 420</td>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 428</td>
<td>Lunch / Catering</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 430</td>
<td>Telephone/Telecom</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 440</td>
<td>Postage &amp; Shipping</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 460</td>
<td>Computer Service</td>
<td>$918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 480</td>
<td>Travel In-State</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 490</td>
<td>Travel Out-State</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 541</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Capital funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 660</td>
<td>Inter Dept Service (UNET)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 700</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>URSUS (HP)</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Services Non-Employees</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Assessment

- **HEPI Index or ARL Index**
  - **413 UMS Database**
    - Subscriptions: $204,023
  - **542 Software**
    - **Base OCLC Authority**: $15,000
    - **Docutek (ERef, Reserves)**: $7,000
    - **Digital Initiative fund (UMS share)**: $25,000
    - **Innovative (URSUS)**: $63,576

- **New Program Fund**: $250,000.00
Basic Formula and Elements (excluding New Program Fund)

UMS Contribution (base budget + HEPI x code 542 + .5 share of digital initiative) Campus Contribution (databases + ARL index x databases + .5 share of digital initiative = estimated annual costs

Needs as provided by historical budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$ 290,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPI adder (code 542 only)</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$ 3,851 Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Initiative</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 319,296</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Campus assessment*</td>
<td>$ 204,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL Factor</td>
<td>Campus assessment*</td>
<td>$ 20,402 Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Initiative</td>
<td>Campus assessment*</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 249,425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total** $ 568,721

ARL = American Research Library inflation factor (10%)
HEPI = Higher education price index (3.5%) for the year 2005

*See Chart below for 3 different assessment scenarios:
## Fall 2005 Credit Hours by Level by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,669.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,094.00</td>
<td>674.5</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>20,947.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>114,056.00</td>
<td>18,439.00</td>
<td>31,355.00</td>
<td>10,220.00</td>
<td>6,610.00</td>
<td>16,880.00</td>
<td>77,398.00</td>
<td>275,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10,119.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,357.50</td>
<td>22,462.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,689.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>5,982.00</td>
<td>5,073.00</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,381.00</td>
<td>2,097.50</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td>8,057.50</td>
<td>22,863.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,821.00</td>
<td>3,821.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>130,048.00</td>
<td>41,387.00</td>
<td>32,238.00</td>
<td>13,785.00</td>
<td>9,382.00</td>
<td>18,824.00</td>
<td>101,998.00</td>
<td>347,452.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hours after exemption is taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,844.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,083.00</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>15,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>63,263.00</td>
<td>13,480.00</td>
<td>22,847</td>
<td>7,572</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>231,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,021</td>
<td>16,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>16,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95,546</td>
<td>30,588</td>
<td>23,595</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>6,936</td>
<td>13,894</td>
<td>75,015</td>
<td>255,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FALL 2005 CREDIT HOURS AFTER EXEMPTIONS
FOLLOWED BY THREE POSSIBLE ASSESSMENT SCENARIOS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours after exemption is taken</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>83,263.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7,365.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,510.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,165.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95,345.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Associate</td>
<td>$ 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 13,044.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,063.32</td>
<td>$ 492.39</td>
<td>$ 41.172</td>
<td>$ 259.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 83,263.07</td>
<td>$ 13,460.47</td>
<td>$ 22,897.18</td>
<td>$ 7,971.50</td>
<td>$ 4,825.30</td>
<td>$ 12,161.80</td>
<td>$ 56,449.08</td>
<td>$ 201,079.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Masters</td>
<td>$ 8,125.56</td>
<td>$ 4.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 9,020.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 1,888.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 Non-Degree</td>
<td>$ 2,369.20</td>
<td>$ 3,043.80</td>
<td>$ 392.40</td>
<td>$ 821.45</td>
<td>$ 943.88</td>
<td>$ 630.00</td>
<td>$ 4,834.00</td>
<td>$ 12,865.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 95,666</td>
<td>$ 29,553</td>
<td>$ 23,420</td>
<td>$ 9,884</td>
<td>$ 6,576</td>
<td>$ 13,414</td>
<td>$ 75,004</td>
<td>$ 253,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.95 Associate</td>
<td>$ 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 12,392.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,029.15</td>
<td>$ 467.77</td>
<td>$ 39.113</td>
<td>$ 246.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05 Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 87,426.22</td>
<td>$ 14,133.49</td>
<td>$ 24,042.04</td>
<td>$ 8,370.18</td>
<td>$ 5,066.57</td>
<td>$ 12,759.89</td>
<td>$ 59,324.03</td>
<td>$ 211,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Masters</td>
<td>$ 8,125.56</td>
<td>$ 4.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 9,020.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 1,888.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 Non-Degree</td>
<td>$ 2,369.20</td>
<td>$ 3,043.80</td>
<td>$ 392.40</td>
<td>$ 821.45</td>
<td>$ 943.88</td>
<td>$ 630.00</td>
<td>$ 4,834.00</td>
<td>$ 12,865.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 99,629</td>
<td>$ 29,574</td>
<td>$ 24,434</td>
<td>$ 10,021</td>
<td>$ 6,478</td>
<td>$ 13,791</td>
<td>$ 77,815</td>
<td>$ 261,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.95 Associate</td>
<td>$ 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 12,392.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,029.15</td>
<td>$ 467.77</td>
<td>$ 39.113</td>
<td>$ 246.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 83,263.07</td>
<td>$ 13,460.47</td>
<td>$ 22,897.18</td>
<td>$ 7,971.50</td>
<td>$ 4,825.30</td>
<td>$ 12,161.80</td>
<td>$ 56,449.08</td>
<td>$ 201,079.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Masters</td>
<td>$ 8,125.56</td>
<td>$ 4.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 9,020.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 1,888.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95 Non-Degree</td>
<td>$ 3,026.32</td>
<td>$ 3,856.48</td>
<td>$ 497.04</td>
<td>$ 787.17</td>
<td>$ 1,195.58</td>
<td>$ 798.00</td>
<td>$ 6,124.70</td>
<td>$ 16,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 96,303</td>
<td>$ 29,713</td>
<td>$ 23,394</td>
<td>$ 9,788</td>
<td>$ 6,489</td>
<td>$ 13,351</td>
<td>$ 75,280</td>
<td>$ 255,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority 2  
Goal 4.3 A single well-funded research library requires an increase in Fogler Library’s base budget and capital funding for new addition to the library

Summary: In order for Fogler Library to expand and solidify its role as University of Maine System leader in the development of research collections and establishment of expanded digital collections to the benefit of all campuses, Fogler needs an updated facility and adequate support for collections and staff to realize this core goal of SD#4:

- **Research collections**: an increase of $1 million each year for five ($5,000,000 base then indexed to inflation)
  - Percentage shares of UMS research grants and bonds should also be considered as a means building the collection.
- **Library staffing to meet UM and System research needs**: $560,418
  - 2 public services, 3 technical services staff, 4 support staff, 2 FTE student staff.
- **Funding for new Fogler Library physical addition**: $26,000,000
  - Build 95,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs (addition only, no renovation)

Details:
Research Collections Funding: $5 million phased in over 5 years

Fogler Library needs an increase in its base budget to acquire resources that will address research needs across the System. This plan does not eliminate the need for the other campus libraries to specialize in their own local collections to support the research. The campus libraries must be mission driven to succeed in supporting their own communities. Resources will continue to be shared with all UM System researchers via e-mail delivery of online resources and courier delivery.

**Staffing base budget increases for Fogler Library to meet UM and System needs: $560,418**

Five professional staff for the following responsibilities:

Two public services librarians to continue the work of virtual reference, manage the last copy center, provide Information Literacy support, continue subject liaison work including collection development at UM, and provide research and reference assistance to other campus faculty and students, as well as other statewide users

Three technical services staff to do the programming for locally created databases and products, to assist UMS libraries in processing materials as needed, to work on issues with commercial databases, to work on implementation and issues from commercial service providers, to maintain and troubleshoot problems with any technical issue both at Fogler Library and for the System

Four support staff for the following responsibilities:

Operate last copy center, including document delivery solutions, provide for more building hours in the library, operate digitizing equipment, provide more service hours for some departments, support of technical services librarians

Two FTE student staff for the following responsibilities:

Provide support for the hours and services listed above.

**Funding for Fogler Library addition and renovation: $26,000,000**

Build 95,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs (addition only, no renovation)
Fogler Library’s current space problems must be addressed. Fogler’s responsibility as the “single UMS doctoral/research library” requires that it maintain collections for the future generations of users for the entire System. Space is needed to meet this requirement and to meet the needs of staff and users.

Fogler Library has a functionally obsolete building and is at capacity. It has very limited individual study space, lacks any group study space, and houses a collection of only one million volumes. As such the library does not appropriately support the educational and research requirements for the University, the UMS System, it’s legislatively designated role as the State’s Business Science and Technology library, and other community, library and State demands. Space is needed for these multiple purposes.

Construction of a 95,000 square foot addition is not a luxury but a basic necessity to accommodate collections, services, and to provide appropriate study spaces be redesigned and the center core stacks removed to address safety and accessibility issues.

To ensure the most cost effective storage solution for collection growth, installation of compact shelving in the Library Annex building is required. To move beyond the needs of UM to the UMS and the State an addition to the annex is needed. This will provide long-term growth space for collections. **Future Capital Request: $1 million**

The creation of a “Last Copy Center” will serve and benefit libraries of all types throughout the state. A last copy center is a central facility managed by librarians that would allow Maine libraries to preserve titles that might be removed from other collections due to space or usage concerns. Such a facility would permit all libraries to discard their copy of the item going to the Last Copy Center, thereby saving space in local libraries. The storage facility would also provide interlibrary loan services or electronic document delivery of the material upon request. **Future Capital Request: Approximately $2 million**

**Fogler Research Center Budgeting/Funding Options:**

Fogler Library’s budget has to be indexed against inflation and it needs a funding formula that allows it to grow as the University’s numbers of students and programs grow, including a share of campus research funds, external grants, and internal and external bonding opportunities. We estimate that within five years journal inflation will require an additional annual expenditure of $2.6 million just to maintain current library subscriptions. Other research institutions have been increasing their library budget to account for journal inflation, approximately 11% annually. For example, UNH went from a budget of $8.8 million in 2002 to $14.1 million in 2004 and the budget will increase by $500,000 next year. Several funding options should be considered:

**Phased Funding Improvement:**
- The plan calls for an increase of $1 million each year in base funding for the library’s acquisitions budget to compensate for current materials inflation costs and to acquire materials that the library was unable to purchase in past years. In other words, over five years there would be a $5 million increase. After that the materials budget could be indexed for annual inflation.

**Share of UMS Bonds to Support Research Resources:**
- The library would receive a larger but decreasing portion of the bond funds as follows: Year 1: $3 million; Year 2: $2.5 million; Year 3: $2 million; Year 4: $1.75 million; Year 5: $1.5 million. This could be accomplished by moving 10% of the bond money from facilities to Library.

**Share of UMS Research Grants to support Research:**
- The library would receive 4% of indirect costs obtained from grants over the 2004 baseline. By 2010, this would mean the library would be getting the equivalent 2% of all indirect costs, which is the average for academic libraries in the U.S.) The 4% of indirect cost would be taken off from the current 25% going to facilities and administration.
Strategic Direction 4: Libraries

4.1 - Vision Statement is now operational

Recommendation: Create new UMS Library Vision Statement

Performance Metric Questions:

- Has UMS Library Vision Statement been created?
- Who knows about the new vision statement?
- How does the vision statement guide the UMS Library program?
- How can the vision statement be disseminated?

Recommendation Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction 4.1</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vision statement is publicly available</td>
<td>UMS publicists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked, faculty can locate and explain the vision statement in the context of their library expectations</td>
<td>Faculty, Students, Chief Academic Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning is underway to continuously improve constituents understanding of the &quot;vision&quot; of the UMS Library</td>
<td>Library Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What additional metrics or evaluative questions would you include as a result of your progress?
## Strategic Direction 4.2
### Libraries
#### 4.2 - Priority Four - UMS Library Consortium

**Recommendation**

- Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a State-wide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

### Performance Metric Questions

- Are the UMS Libraries more efficient and cost effective in maintaining and building the UMS journal collection?
- Is each campus’ general monograph collection more curriculum focused than it was in 2006?
- Have the libraries of the UMS increased the promotion of and integration of information literacy into campus curricula?
- Are UMS library funds being used to their best advantage?
- Is there evidence that libraries in the UMS are becoming “true centers of learning?”

### Recommendation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction 4.2</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the key stakeholders involved and engaged in this process?</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officers, Library Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide any additional relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you operating within your budgetary parameters?</td>
<td>Library directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendation being implemented ahead of schedule, on schedule, or behind schedule?</td>
<td>Collection development librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the key stakeholders involved and engaged in this process?</td>
<td>Library directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the process in terms of cost containment?</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Questions

- Have the libraries of the UMS increased the promotion of and integration of information literacy into campus curricula?
- Is each campus’ general monograph collection more curriculum focused than it was in 2006?
- Are UMS library funds being used to their best advantage?
- Is there evidence that libraries in the UMS are becoming “true centers of learning?”

### Additional Metrics

- Have there been any additional metrics or evaluative questions included as a result of progress?
4.3 Develop a well-funded research library at the University of Maine

Performance Metric Questions

- Are all parties responsible for creating the research library at UM on board?
- Is there a leadership team and timeline for fundraising for the building?
- Is the funding for the research materials in place?
- Is funding for staffing for the added research functions in place?

Recommendation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction 4.3</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 - Priority two - Research Library at UM</td>
<td>Are the key stakeholders involved and engaged in this process?</td>
<td>Are you operating within your budgetary parameters?</td>
<td>Is this recommendation being implemented ahead of schedule, on schedule or behind schedule?</td>
<td>Is the person tasked to lead implementation effectively managing the process?</td>
<td>Provide any additional relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>UM and other Presidents, All UMS Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A public campaign for the research library has been announced</td>
<td>UM and UM CFO's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A phased plan for funding research materials has been approved</td>
<td>UMS and UM CFO's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing for the new research library has been planned</td>
<td>UM and UMS CFOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What additional metrics or evaluative questions would you include as a result of your progress?
Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a State-wide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

Performance Metric Questions

- Has CEO of Maine Info Net been hired?
- Is the Maine Info Net Board created and functional?
- Does the public know what Maine Info Net is?
- Are we as a state, better off (access to libraries, greater efficiencies, better representation from all constituents,) now that Maine Info Net is operational?

Recommendation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction 4.4</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the key stakeholders involved and engaged in this process?</td>
<td>Are you operating within your budgetary parameters?</td>
<td>Is this recommendation being implemented ahead of schedule, on schedule or behind schedule?</td>
<td>Is the person tasked to lead implementation effectively managing the process?</td>
<td>Provide any additional relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO is in place and leading as expected</td>
<td>Rumery &amp; Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board is in place and working on strategies to implement strategic plan</td>
<td>CEO Board Chair Library Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public has growing knowledge of Maine Info Net and usage is increasing</td>
<td>Public Surveys Library feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More people are using library services, more libraries are participating in service delivery and library systems are working well</td>
<td>CEO Libraries Board Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What additional metrics or evaluative questions would you include as a result of your progress?
### Strategic Direction 4

#### Libraries

**4.5 Priority one - Base Budget**

- **Recommendation**
  - With formula, establish base-budget for UMS Digital library resources & services

#### Performance Metric Questions

- Has the campus assessment formula been presented to campus CFO's and will they support it?
- Do campus leaders understand that new programs added will require library funding based on the formula?
- Has the campus assessment formula been approved and implemented for FY 2007 and beyond?
- Has the UMS budget office devised a process for managing the collection of funds from campuses to supplement the UMS URSUS/Digital Library existing base budget?

#### Recommendation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction 4.5</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the key stakeholders involved and engaged in this process?</td>
<td>Are you operating within your budgetary parameters?</td>
<td>Is this recommendation being implemented ahead of schedule, on schedule or behind schedule?</td>
<td>Is the person tasked to lead implementation effectively managing the process?</td>
<td>Provide any additional relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMS compound budget (URSUS/Digital library base budget &amp; credit hour/program level) is in place</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus program approval processes are following new guidelines and formula</td>
<td>Campus CAOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMS URSUS/Digital Library is functioning without reduction in services</td>
<td>Campus Library Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What additional metrics or evaluative questions would you include as a result of your progress?
STRATEGIC DIRECTION #4: ENHANCING LIBRARY RESOURCES

Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a statewide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

Summary:

Goal 4.1 (Currently Operational): New UMS Library Vision Statement

The UMS Libraries have a critical and vibrant role on campus, off campus, and throughout the State in preparing students and all Maine citizens to function successfully within the global and creative economies and to be life-long learners. The UMS Libraries are a consortium that works collaboratively and cooperatively, along with the other URSUS libraries, to provide systematic and efficient library resources and services. Digital technology provides the means to offer universal access to all users and to provide new combinations of resources, services, and delivery systems. The Libraries offer both virtual and physical spaces. They are centers of learning on their individual campuses and also serve their public communities. By partnering with faculty in the learning process, the UMS Libraries actively promote and teach information literacy and support research. The Libraries are engaged in continual assessment of their outcomes and effectiveness in providing information and services to students, faculty, researchers and Maine citizens.

Goal 4.5 (Priority 1): Based on a new funding formula establish a permanent base-budget investment in UMS digital library resources and services.

The major limitation to further expansion of the digital collections has been the necessity and ongoing uncertainty of cobbling together funding at every step. Grants, bonds and other one-time funding for years has been the backbone of this initiative. For the libraries to continue to make online and other technologically based resources available to all students, faculty and staff on all campuses as well as to Maine citizens, a significant investment in the continued development of the digital library is critical.

The budget outlined below is based on a proposed funding formula (modeled after those in other states) that shares costs by campus according for credit hours and level and type of programs offered. The model also includes inflation factors to address rapidly growing costs of library resources, and a New Program Factor requiring the addition of new library funding when new programs are approved.

In an effort to move beyond maintenance of services and systems (at current levels), the formula also includes a modest increase of $50,000 annually to support startup and testing of digital initiatives. This “initiative fund” is apportioned in the budget equally to the base funding and the campus assessments. Once a high priority digital
initiative has been tested and readied for Maine’s statewide digital library, separate internal or external funding will be required to proceed.

**Goal 4.3 (Priority 2): Develop a well-funded research library at the University of Maine**

Fogler has provided leadership in the areas of developing research collections, establishing the digital library - URSUS, Maine Info Net, full-text electronic database resources, and material delivery. To continue this work and establish the foundation for future success, Fogler must be well supported financially and the physical restraints removed.

### Proposed Increases for Fogler Library Base Budget

- **Base budget increases Fogler Library staffing to meet UM and System needs:** $560,418
  
  Five professional staff for the following responsibilities:
  - Two public services librarians to continue the work of virtual reference, manage the last copy center, provide B.I. support, continue subject liaison work including collection development at UM, and provide research and reference assistance to the state.
  - [at wage band #4 ($36,029 X 43% for benefits = 51521.47) 5 staff = 257,607]

- **Base budget increases Fogler Library staffing to meet UM and System needs continued:**
  
  Three technical services staff to do the programming for locally created databases and products, to assist UMS libraries in processing materials as needed, to work on issues with commercial databases, to work on implementation and issues from commercial service providers, to maintain and troubleshoot problems with any technical issue both at Fogler Library and for the System.
  - [at wage band #4 (36,029 X 43% = 51521.47) 3 staff = $154,564]

  Four support staff for the following responsibilities:
  - Operate last copy center, including document delivery solutions, provide for more building hours in the library, operate digitizing equipment, provide more service hours for some departments, support of technical services librarians.
  - [2 LAI at wage band #14= 9.62hr (20,009.6 X 43% = 28613.73) 2 staff = $57227]
  - [2 LAII at wage band #18 = 10.65hr (22,152 X 43% = 31677.36) 2 staff = $63355]

  Two FTE student staff for the following responsibilities:
  - Provide support for the hours and services listed above.
  - [2 students at pay level II = $6.65, for FTE = 27,664]

- **Base budget increase at Fogler Library for research acquisitions:** $1,000,000
  
  $1 million increase in base funding for each of five years for acquisitions

- **Base budget increase for inflation:**
  
  Index UM Library budget for inflation based on Association of Research Libraries 10 %

- **Funding for Fogler Library addition and renovation:** $26,000,000
  
  Build 95,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs (addition only, no renovation)
Goal 4.4 (Priority 3): Expand the statewide integrated digital library through increased collaboration between the UMS Library Consortium and the Maine State Library using Maine Info Net as a model.

Maine Info Net is the new multi-type collaborative for accessing library information and services for the state of Maine, the primary gateway or portal to library and related information. The model is not new. OhioLink, and Illinet have provided access for years to Ohio and Illinois citizens. The University of Maine System, Colby, Bates and Bowdoin Colleges’ local library systems will continue to serve and be recognized by their local users as their own library system, but it will also become crystal clear that Maine Info Net is the umbrella or overarching library structure and information portal for the libraries of the State of Maine.

Since its inception, the University of Maine System URSUS (digital) library budget has shared in the purchase and delivery of electronic resources offered through Maine Info Net where better prices and negotiating leverage are available on the larger scale statewide basis. Today, legislative, bond, PUC e-rate, and University dollars together provide the foundation digital resources for all Maine library users. Maine Info Net’s expansion and branding will bring all of these resources together under one roof for the user.

Maine Info Net Recommendation 1: A new Info Net Board with members representing all participants will be created: The Board will be a membership organization while assuring substantial accountability to and participation of the membership. For general program delivery, Info Net can be thought of as a “consortium of consortia,” with groups such as MINERVA, URSUS and others acting as the access system service providers, and Maine Info Net providing services to these groups (and their member libraries). The access system service providers are funded through local appropriation of funds. The Info Net services are funded through the Maine State Library and the University of Maine System. This relationship can be visualized as below. (Note: the chart below is intended to be illustrative, and not exhaustive.)

The Maine Library Commission acting through the Maine State Library; and the University of Maine System will be formal partners and the sponsors of Maine Info Net. It is essential for the Maine Library Commission, the Maine State Library, and the University of Maine system to continue to have a significant presence and voice in the continuing development and support of Info Net. The two bodies have already formalized through a Memorandum of Understanding the nature of the sponsorship and the roles and responsibilities of each of the partners.
Reporting Relationships and Authority: Maine Info Net will function in a “sponsored program model” in which Info Net would have its own separate elected Board to which it would report. This Board would be sponsored jointly by the Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System. The two will share decision-making power on the most significant issues, such as the employment of the CEO (Executive Director) and establishment of Info Net policies. The new reporting structure is illustrated below.

Recommendation 2: Maine Info Net will have a CEO and dedicated staff

a. CEO (hired May 1, 2006 after national search) reports to the Maine Info Net Board. The Board has a reporting relationship to the UMS and the Maine Library Commission
b. CEO position has been funded by the UMS and the Maine Library Commission

Probably the biggest shift required relates to the involvement of the University of Maine System as a formal partner with the Maine Library Commission in the administration of Maine Info Net. This will require that the Office of the Chancellor accept and formalize a previously informal role, i.e., that it will fully represent the interests not only of the University System, but also of all other members of the higher education community in the state, whether those institutions are private or public.

The reporting relationship illustrated above includes an important “dotted line” relationship between the Info Net Board and its two sponsors and units, the Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System. Although the formal reporting relationship is to the Library Commission (and not to the State Library), in practice the Maine State Library will serve as the conduit to Info Net for support from Maine Library Commission, and to act as the representative of the interests of public and school libraries. In addition, the State Library will provide technology support and staff in support of the program, and (although not illustrated) serve as the sponsor and represent the interests for MINERVA, unaffiliated libraries, etc.

Recommendation 3: Maine Info Net should be constituted as an independent entity with member institutions (a membership organization)

Governance Model: Any recommended governance model (see illustration below) must not require undue risk, must be affordable, and must enable Info Net to have a clear identity, and have a legal and program status that is recognized by others (particularly by the legislature). Ideally, the governance structure should encourage the organization to be agile and to demonstrate entrepreneurship. The structure must be highly inclusive of all types of libraries. Above all, the resulting organization must be a trusted partner, and must build upon the successes of the past.
Recommendation 4: Maine Info Net requires sustainable funding and reasonable dues ultimately becoming self-sustaining. It is recommended that Info Net continue to be funded primarily from state funds as provided through the Maine State Library. In addition, Info Net members should be charged annual dues (to cover basic infrastructure and overhead costs that are of common benefit to all members), and fees for optional services where each member library can choose whether or not to participate.

The chart below summarizes the anticipated initial major programs and services of Info Net, and the potential source of funding to support those services. In some cases, the service may be funded from only one source of funds, while other services may be funded through a combination. For example, a ground delivery service which currently has baseline funding provided through the University and state funds, may be augmented in the future via general dues, with individual libraries having the option to supplement the basic services if they pay extra fees to do so. Similarly, state funds may be used to fund some e-resources common to all institutions, but Info Net may also negotiate for other resources sought by only a portion of the membership, with the latter paid through optional fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Optional Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union catalog and resource sharing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground delivery</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Reference service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it might be desirable to expect the state to pay all expenses related to Info Net, realistically Info Net should not overly-rely upon any one funding source. By expanding the funding streams, Info Net will not be
subject to the vagaries of state revenues, but it also will enable Info Net to provide services that the libraries desire but that the state might be unable or unwilling to support (or to support in full). The latter services might include:

- development and implementation of a marketing program for libraries on the availability and use of Info Net;
- supplemental electronic resources, which might be purchased in part from state funds and in part from member contributions;
- staff for communications, such as web site updating, or for facilitation, such as to convene and coordinate committee meetings;
- technology consulting and support; and,
- management of the holdings database and the Maine union list of serials.

The exact cost of dues cannot be estimated in any more detail until there is a further articulation as to what costs the dues must support. The dues structure must be viewed by the general membership to be “reasonable.” It is also recognized that any dues or fees may not be met favorably by members. In part, members have developed an unrealistic set of expectations because some of the current operations have been supported through informal subsidies. For example, the University of Maine System and the Maine State Library have been supporting MINERVA at a rate that does not cover the true direct and indirect costs. As long as such informal subsidy continues, it is possible that libraries will not feel any pressure to do something about permanent funding.

(Details of additional recommendations are available in the NELINET Consultants’ Report – contact tabbott@maine.edu or Rumery@maine.edu for copies)

The Maine Info Net staff, lead by the new CEO, and built from current UMS URSUS library and Maine State Library staff members would be responsible for marketing, managing membership dues, and delivering services: the union catalog, delivery, e-resources (databases), standards, portal management, and training.

The current UMS Library Directors’ Council will continue in its current configuration serving as one of the consortia members albeit one of the two that sponsors the Maine Info Net CEO and provides policy direction to him or her and the Board.

(Goal 4.2) Priority 4: Enhance and strengthen the effectiveness of the UMS Library Consortium – cost containment

The UMS Library System consortium is strong and has been successful, but to continue to provide the resources and services demanded by users it has to move forward into more collaborative efforts.

Collection Development: Journals
The UMS Libraries will become more collaborative and efficient when selecting and providing access to expanding digital collections. The UMS Libraries will seek to eliminate duplicate subscriptions by evolving collaborative collection development for online serials. Collection development staff will create a core collection of journals in electronic formats for the University of Maine System libraries with licensure agreements that address archival concerns, while phasing out hard copy journal subscriptions where complete online documents exist. License agreements, where feasible, will take into consideration the needs of researchers across all campuses.

Collection Development: Monographs
The UMS Libraries will develop a cooperative collection development strategy that will allow each campus to build local general collections but also encourage the development of non-duplicative, campus strengths to benefit the entire consortium. (For example, perhaps Farmington is the designated strength for undergraduate materials in education). Cooperative strategies will also eliminate unnecessarily duplication of little used or very expensive
items in the state. UM and USM currently use approval plan software which can be used to facilitate such coordination. (Possible model: Tri-College Consortium in Pennsylvania).

**Information Literacy**
The UMS Libraries will work cooperatively to share information literacy best practices, course guides, and classroom successes with the goal of producing robust and integrated literacy programs at all campuses. Information Literacy programs not only meet NEASC information literacy expectations but ensure that Maine students are receiving these essential skills across all campuses. Given the minimal staffing at most campus libraries working cooperatively will help maximize skills, resources and best practices.

**Research**
The UMS Libraries will recognize the research needs of faculty at all campuses and will work collaboratively to provide access to collections and services where necessary. This collaborative will bring a strong emphasis to research statewide.

**Partnerships and Centers for Learning**
The UMS Libraries will constantly seek partnerships and collaborative opportunities on their campuses. Today’s academic library is not merely a repository of resources and the source of user services, but a true center for learning on our campuses.

**Delivery Service**
Maintain the System commitment to the very successful statewide delivery service for tangible items.
## APPENDICES

### Participants: Strategic Direction #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Salo</td>
<td>BOT Faculty Representative, UMPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara McDade</td>
<td>Library Director, Bangor Public Library, URSUS Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Phipps</td>
<td>Library Director, UMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hepler</td>
<td>Interim Director, UM School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nutty</td>
<td>Director University Libraries, USM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Brown</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English, UMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Greenlaw</td>
<td>Library Director, USM L-A College, Head of Reference USM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Roberts</td>
<td>Library Director, UMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Nichols</td>
<td>Maine State Librarian, URSUS Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Dube</td>
<td>Former Director UNET Technology Services, UMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Curtis</td>
<td>Director, Library and Learning Resources UMPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Gamache</td>
<td>Professor of Sociology, UMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rumery</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries, UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen King</td>
<td>BOT Student Representative, UMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen March</td>
<td>Professor of Spanish, UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Gallucci</td>
<td>Former URSUS Library System Manager UMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Lutz</td>
<td>Director of Information Planning Fogler Library UM and UMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Richard</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Social Studies, UMFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Grillo</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Art, UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kimball</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Sociology/Anthropology, UMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bouzrara</td>
<td>Associate Professor of French, USM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rice</td>
<td>Professor of Wood Science, UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Co-Chair through 6/1/05, Vice President Academic Affairs, UMFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Albert</td>
<td>Co-Chair after 6/1/05, Interim Vice President Academic Affairs, UMFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Bushway</td>
<td>Professor of Food Science, UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Johnson</td>
<td>Dean of Information Services, UMFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lowe</td>
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Chancellor Westfal’s Reaction to Draft One

September 8, 2005

Dear Dr. Abbott and Dr. Albert:

I want to thank you for your leadership of the Strategic Direction 4 Implementation Planning Committee. As you know, the imperatives and outcomes of this Direction are crucial to the future of the University System and its goal of building an expansive, high-quality, integrated library system that will allow greater dissemination of information for our students and the citizens of Maine. As such, the work of this committee has a significant impact on nearly all aspects of the Strategic Plan - making your work all the more challenging and important.

The Strategic Direction 4 committee's high level of expertise, cooperation, and intensive work comes through in this First Report, which superbly demonstrates how effective and productive this process can be when faculty take the lead. In fact, your report should serve as a model for other committees, as they prepare for next year's work.

I would like to share with you my comments on the Report and provide guidelines for preparing the second and third reports. I considered its overall strengths and weaknesses; its consistency with the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan; and the effectiveness of its delivery.

Overall the report is excellent - visionary, detailed, relevant, and clearly presented. Most importantly, each recommendation effectively connects to the goals of the Strategic Plan and follows the methodologies outlined in the Implementation Plan. By dividing the work among four subcommittees, you were able to generate a significant number of specific, original ideas for improving and expanding UMS libraries in areas addressing overall vision, the library consortium, collaborative initiatives, and base-budgeting. The documentation of budgetary data was very helpful, as well.

There is one area that warrants further exploration going forward into next year's work. I would like the committee to go into greater detail about its proposal for a new Info Net Board. Future recommendations should articulate a more specific plan for how this would work collaboratively, and should address contractual matters and institutional alignment.

Looking ahead to the second and third reports, your goal will be to build on the work already done and to formulate a clear plan of action that focuses on outcomes and assessments. The second report will be, essentially, a first draft of the final report, rather than a separate sequential document. Conceptually, I would like the committee to ask the questions: What will this plan look like in two years? How will we know we have accomplished our goals? From these questions, the committee should be able to frame a set of outcomes and assessments for full implementation that acknowledge the most relevant intersections with other Strategic Directions.

Because budgeting is a significant factor for implementation, the committee should prioritize its recommendations by following the "Decision-Making Matrix" on the following page, which will help establish the goals that are most or least urgent and most or least costly. In terms of format, the second report should begin with an executive summary, followed by revised recommendations that include outcomes and assessments. The total length of the report should not exceed 10 pages.

These are preliminary guidelines for approaching the next round of reports. We will discuss this further at the upcoming Implementation Planning retreat on September 16, which will serve as a kick-off to next year's work.

Once again, I thank you and your committee for your hard work and commitment to higher education in Maine. Already your contributions have begun to make a positive difference, and I look forward to the coming year as the integration of the planning process leads us to full implementation next spring. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Westphal
Chancellor
Current Challenges and Concerns Facing Academic Libraries

Scholarly and Scientific Communication
- Innovative new ways of communicating new knowledge using advanced information technologies
- Impact of open access “publishing” and the need to facilitate change in the exchange of scholarly information
- Potential for significant changes in publication process using the World Wide Web
- Need to support parallel paper and electronic methods of knowledge dissemination

Change in Higher Education
- Sustained economic pressure on the entire UMS.
- Pressures to increase distance education and the blurring of geographic boundaries
- Political pressure and need to work beyond traditional UMS boundaries
- Changing needs of long-term learners
- Challenge of integrating information literacy in general education process, across all disciplines

Changing Role of the Library
- Need to redefine library collections and services for the digital era
- Support for an environment that encompasses both print and electronic resources
- Necessity to collaborate with new partners to fulfill the mission
- Libraries forced to compete with private sector for information delivery and retrieval
- Need to preserve the value of research as a process

Information Literacy
- Integration of information literacy skills into the larger curriculum
- Need to understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally
- Need for users to know how to evaluate information and its sources critically
- Need for users to acquire and maintain important life-long learning skills

Technology Infrastructure
- New and changing infrastructure needed for electronic resources
- Operations funding for technical infrastructure to support digital library

Increased Cost and Amounts of information
- Scientific information inflation rate of 12% annually for the past decade
- Rising costs and decrease in publication of scholarly monographs
- Cost of scholarly print publications have been increasing at an annual rate of 7%
- High cost of providing access to (licensing) scientific databases
- Libraries are acquiring a decreasing percentage of the published literature due to increasing costs of digitized materials
- New forms of electronic information are available, needed, and heavily used--and do not necessarily replace paper
- Information needed by faculty and students is increasing exponentially in the sciences
- Interdisciplinary research/new fields of research have increased faculty need for new information

Organizational Culture
- Library, academic, and technological planning often done in isolation from each other.
- Libraries are less integrated into campus and UMS information infrastructure than is desirable
- Tension between campus autonomy and "System"
- Diversity of library users
- Changing information seeking behaviors of newer younger users

**Funding**
- Lack of funding for inflation and added new academic programs in library budgets
- UMS library allocation funding model does not reflect changes in library functions and responsibilities nor academic program expansion

**Human Resources**
- Lack of widespread expertise in areas critical to instituting change and adopting new technologies
- Recruitment hampered by low salaries

**Information Market Place**
- No new business model has emerged for digital information publication costs
- Increasing tendency to price by transaction
- Rapid pace of technology and business change
- Intellectual property law shifting away from "fair use" and in favor of the publisher
- Content providers experiencing difficulty absorbing enormous change into their business practices
- Lack of standards for content
- Open access policies v. information as a commodity (intellectual property rights)
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**Strategic Direction - 5**

**RESEARCH**

Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine’s economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Request Additional R&amp;D Funds from the State to Support Sponsored Research</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Chancellor, Gov't. Relations, Presidents, VPRs</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Strengthen Sponsored Research by Coordinating the Process of Requesting Increased Funding</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>VPRs</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Increase Graduate Student Funding</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Chancellor, Gov't. Relations, Presidents, Deans of Graduate Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Enhance the Graduate Education Experience and Build the System’s Research and Scholarly Capacity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Presidents, Provosts, VPRs, Deans of Graduate Students, Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Direction - 5

**RESEARCH**

Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine's economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.5</strong> <strong>Set Greater Incentives for Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Expression</strong></td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Provosts, VPRs, Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Low - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.6</strong> <strong>Support Faculty in Generating Grants and Contracts</strong></td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Provosts, VPRs, Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Low - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.7</strong> <strong>Expand Opportunities for Undergraduate Research</strong></td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Provosts, VPRs, Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Low - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

5.1 Request additional R&D funds from the State to support sponsored research

Performance Metric Questions

What is the growth in MEIF funds from the base year amount of $12 million?

How many collaborative MEIF-related research projects have been undertaken or are in progress between USM/UMaine and other campuses?

What new categories of research important to the State's economy outside of the seven categories identified in the MEIF as of 2006 have been sanctioned, has a fund analogous to MEIF been established for these categories, and what level of funds has been appropriated to it?

How many dollars collected by UMS from the indirect costs recovered by UMaine and USM have been transferred as match to the professional development accounts for scholarship at the other five campuses?

Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine’s economy.
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Research

5.2 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine’s economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Strengthen sponsored research by coordinating the process of requesting increased funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Metric Questions

- Has USM's Office of Sponsored Programs provided at least one training session annually for the campuses at Augusta and Farmington in order to build grant-seeking and grant-management capacity? Are principal investigators at these campuses satisfied with the consultation available to them through USM's OSP?

- Has UMaine's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs provided at least one training session annually for the campuses at Fort Kent, Machias, and Presque Isle in order to build grant-seeking and grant-management capacity? Are principal investigators at these campuses satisfied with the consultation available to them through UMaine's ORSP?

- Has a calendar for requests of annual R&D bond and operating funds been established and communicated to all campuses?

- Are the various campuses satisfied that the process for coordinating and determining system-wide priorities for R&D bond and operating funds is fair, and that decisions by the UMS have been communicated in a clear and timely fashion?
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5.3 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine’s economy.

Performance Metric Questions

At what percentage of the median compensation for assistantships at peer institutions are graduate teaching and research assistantships in the University of Maine System, considering Masters and Doctoral students separately?

- By what number have institutionally funded graduate assistantships at U Maine and USM grown since school year 2005-2006?

- By what number have externally funded graduate research assistantships at U Maine and USM grown since school year 2005-2006?

- By what number have graduate assistantships in professional masters programs grown since school year 2005-2006?

- What is the growth at U Maine and USM in endowed and/or named graduate scholarships, compared with school year 2005-2006?
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5.4 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Strengthen and leverage research throughout the State to ensure greater breadth and depth of research. Develop a greater capacity to use research, scholarship, and creative expression to enhance Maine’s economy.

5.4 Set greater incentives for faculty research, scholarship, and creative expression

Performance Metric Questions

- At what level have "graduate venture capital funds" been provided to the Graduate Schools at U Maine and USM to cover basic administrative and instructional costs of interdisciplinary courses and programs needed to fill emerging areas of state and national need?
- How many collaborative graduate education programs are being offered between campuses with such programs in place and campuses that want to provide access to graduate education but don't have capacity to do so on their own?
- In the appointment and reappointment of graduate faculty, does each school, department or other units sponsoring graduate degree programs have clear, written criteria that recognize and reward strong faculty performance in graduate research, scholarship and education?
- What has been the growth in on-line, full-text literature available to faculty and students engaged in graduate research and education, compared with such availability as of school year 2005-2006?
- At what rate are analytical instrumentation and cyber infrastructure being upgraded and replaced, as benchmarked against state-of-the art equipment and facilities in the respective scientific fields in which the System's campuses are engaged in graduate education?
5.5 Set greater incentives for faculty research, scholarship, and creative expression

Performance Metric Questions

- What has been the increase in endowed Professorships and Professors, systemwide and at each campus, based on excellence in research compared with school year 2005-2006?

- What percentage of indirect costs above an established baseline is being returned to faculty and their Department or Center?

- How many faculty have received Post-Tenure Review salary increments as a result of scholarly success?

- At each campus, what is the dollar value of incentives, and the number awarded, for non-faculty with advanced degrees wishing to engage in research?
### Performance Metric Questions

- What percentage of faculty, by campus, have access to true broadband?
- What is the satisfaction level among principal investigators that their digital library needs are being met?  
  (NOTE: See also Recommendation 5.4 concerning access to full-text digital library resources.)
- What is the satisfaction level among principal investigators with their ability to hire research personnel in a timely way and to easily access and analyze progress on post-award budgets?
- How many administrative staff involved in the support of research grants and programs have received salary incentives for outstanding service?
Strategic Direction 5

Research

5.7 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

**Recommendation**

5.7 Expand opportunities for undergraduate research

**Performance Metric Questions**

- What percentage of undergraduate students have access to up-to-date equipment and software, provided system-wide, in their scholarly activities?

- What is the increase in number of Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU) proposals to NSF compared with 2006-2007? What is the funding success rate?

- By campus, what is the number of undergraduate students participating in one-on-one independent study courses with faculty related to the faculty member's area of scholarship or research?

- What percentage of undergraduate students have access to up-to-date equipment and software, provided system-wide, in their scholarly activities?
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Strategic Direction #7 – Business Operations

Final Report

Strategic Direction 7 – Centralize the System’s business administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

Executive Summary

Business operations consist of finance and accounting, internal audit, procurement, facilities and risk management and other institutional support services for the faculty, staff and students of the University of Maine System. [Business support services associated with student administrative support, information technology and human resources are covered by other SD #7 reports.] The efficiency of these services is maximized through the integration of appropriate technology, the establishment of proper processes and procedures, and a streamlined organizational structure.

The overall vision statement for SD #7 articulates the approach the financial management of UMS is taking to transform ourselves into more value added financial organization(s). The following specific initiatives are in progress by the senior financial management as we strive to reach this more value added, less transaction driven role:

7.1 Enhanced CFO role within our institutions – Increased participation in exploring creative solutions to closing the UMS financial gap.

7.2 Complete PeopleSoft Financials implementation, other common software solutions – Continue to strive for maximum utilization of this new ERP toolkit

7.3 Accountability - Establish improved system of internal and financial controls
   a. Preventative internal control procedures to improve operating efficiencies, accuracy in financial reporting and improved safeguarding of assets
   b. New financial planning process with enhanced accountability and transparency; includes financial parameters for campus debt capacity and techniques to improve the financial health of System institutions

7.4 Asset management – In conjunction with SD #6, establish strategies to renew capital assets to maintain and upgrade facilities
   a. Energy management
   b. Capital renewal – state funding for E&G facilities
   c. Facilities data management – provide accurate and appropriate data to facilitate critical facility decisions

7.5 Collaboration – Enhance partnerships with Maine’s community colleges, K-16 DOE initiatives, and within our UMS organizations, both financial and non-financial, to create seamlessness among our affiliated institutions
The Chief Financial Officers are an existing group which meets routinely. As a result of this strategic initiative, we have taken a fresh look at the role of the senior financial management in the UMS and the long-term vision for our financial organizations. This report serves to articulate that vision and the related implementation initiatives which are in progress.

The backbone for many of our recommendations is the successful deployment of our new PeopleSoft Financial System. As noted in our previous reports, this system has many advantages over our legacy systems including full integration with other applications, enhanced reporting and self-service, elimination of duplicate entry of data, robust account structure which will provide for data-driven financial analysis and accountability, improved workforce management tools, and many other efficiencies. This modern ERP system has incredible data information and reporting capabilities. In order to capitalize on that data capability, processes, procedures and organization structure must be transformed to maximize our investment in this new toolkit.

**Change management will continue to be our greatest non-budgetary challenge.** Additional policies and procedures will need to be revised and developed to take advantage of the powerful tools being implemented. Continued extensive staff retraining will be required. The full benefits of the new management system will be achieved after intensive staff development and system analysis.

**Investment Budget**

Cost saving, cost avoidance, and revenue enhancement are the major goals defined for Strategic Direction 7. These are needed to assure the continued financial health of the University of Maine System as it addresses future financial challenges ranging from regular increases in operational expenses, to increasing post-employment costs, to support for the strategic initiatives outlined in other sections of the Strategic Plan, to the need for $300 million in capital asset renewal identified through the most recent capital planning process.

**Summary**

Once again, as an attachment, is the report “System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities”, a comprehensive document of System shared services including accountability for efficiencies realized from shared “centralized” services. This attachment was first presented as part of the 2005 SD #7 May reports and has been updated for activities of the past year. This report will be periodically updated to document the efficiencies which have been gained through a System approach to shared services in higher education in Maine.
## Final Report - Strategic Direction 7

Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>CFO's</td>
<td>(not appropriate to prioritize as all initiatives are in progress except 7.4.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - On-going</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.1 Enhanced CFO role within our institutions – Increased participation in exploring creative solutions to closing the UMS financial gap.

- **Low**: Low 2
- **N/A**: N/A
- **High**: High 2

### 7.2 Complete PeopleSoft Financials implementation, other common software solutions – Continue to strive for maximum utilization of this new ERP toolkit

- **Medium**: Medium 1
- **Capital expenditure already budgeted**: 1
- **Low/Medium**: Low/Medium 1

### 7.3 Accountability - Establish improved system of internal and financial controls

- **Low**: Low 2
- **Low**: Low 2
- **Low/Medium**: Low/Medium 2

### a. Preventative internal control procedures to improve operating efficiencies, accuracy in financial reporting and improved safeguarding of assets

- **Controller, KPMG, Director of Internal Reporting**: Low 2

### b. New financial planning process with enhanced accountability and transparency; includes financial parameters for campus debt capacity and techniques to improve the financial health of System institutions

- **CFO's**: Low 2
Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.4 Asset management – In conjunction with SD #6, establish strategies to renew capital assets to maintain and upgrade facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Element</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>Low $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Energy Mgmt. Team, CFO’s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - On-going</td>
<td>Medium $300 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>Chancellor, BOT, Presidents, CAO’s, CFO’s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - One time</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.5 Collaboration – Enhance partnerships with Maine’s community colleges, K-16 DOE initiatives, and within our UMS organizations, both financial and non-financial, to create seamlessness among our affiliated institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Element</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>MHEP, Chancellor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - One time</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

- Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

- Enhanced CFO role within our institutions - increased participation in exploring creative solutions to closing the UMS financial gap.

Performance Metric Questions

- Have new collaborative activities produced measurable efficiency savings?

- Have CFO's and CIO's met together routinely on at least a quarterly basis?
Strategic Direction 7
Business Operations
7.2 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Complete PeopleSoft Financials implementation, other common software solutions - Continue to strive for maximum utilization of this new ERP toolkit

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

► Has the Phase 2 PeopleSoft financials system for grants and contracts been successfully implemented?

► Has e-payment implementation System-wide been completed?
### Performance Metric Questions

- Has there been a reduction in KPMG management letter comments, A-133 findings?

- Has a fair and incentive-based allocation formula and accountability measures for shared services been implemented for FY08?

- Have financial parameters been established to evaluate campus and institutional debt capacity in accordance with UMS policy?

- Has the document "System Services: Supporting Maine's Public Universities" been updated and distributed?

- Has a reporting strategy and new reporting tools enhanced the decision making process at the campus and system level? If so, How?

- Has multi-year financial planning strategies resulted in creative solutions to closing the UMS financial gap?
Asset management - In conjunction with SD #6, establish strategies to renew capital assets to maintain and upgrade facilities

Performance Metric Questions

- What's the status of the assessment and implementation of common facilities data management system(s)?
- Have new energy management initiatives been identified? If so, have any been implemented?
- Has state funding been approved for a portion of UMS facilities renewal backlog?
- Has unfunded depreciation been funded with an incremental 1/10th per year?
- Is facilities management data being continuously updated?
- Have campus strategic plans, master plans and capital plans been completed?
Performance Metric Questions

- Have CFO’s made measurable contributions to the Maine Higher Education Partnership?
The potential long-term savings in increased productivity, reduced liability, improved retention, and employee morale far outweigh the needed investments in human resources. While process and program improvements can result in lower transaction costs, the focus in human resources should be expanded to include true added value and reduced risk.

Human Resources is currently more centralized than many other functions in UMS. This results from several circumstances: UMS is legally one employer; collective bargaining contracts are system-wide; employee benefits programs apply System-wide; and payroll processes are centrally managed. These central functions serve UMS well.

Despite this level of centralized services, each university HR department is to a large extent a “full service” function for employees. Each university provides benefits enrollment and information; responds to grievances; manages local payroll data entry; conducts recruitment and hiring; advises supervisors, managers and executives; carries out compensation programs, and delivers employee development programs.

Each university has talented and dedicated HR staff, but resources are uneven. Only two universities have professionals dedicated to training and employee development. HR generalists at smaller universities are stretched to know the intricacies of benefit programs, bargaining contracts and legal requirements. Programs developed at one university are not known about or available to another. A more integrated approach to human resources could more effectively share resources, resulting in improved service at all universities.

The human resources area is one of high risk for every employer. Salaries, wages and benefits represent a large proportion (approximately 70%) of the UMS budget. Consequently, it is imperative that employees are productive and that salary, wage and benefit levels are competitive without being wasteful.

Another potentially high cost related to human resources is the cost of complaints related to employment actions. This includes discrimination and harassment complaints filed with state and federal agencies, internal complaints and grievances, and suits. HR functions such as supervisory development, misconduct investigations, and resolution of complaints are directed at reducing legal costs and improving morale and productivity.

The recommendations of the Implementation Committee address both efficiencies in transactions and investments directed at the more meaningful long-term savings such as those described above. The SD 7 Human Resources Implementation Planning Committee recommends seven specific initiatives. These improvements will result in better coordinated, integrated, high quality human resource programs consistent with the vision for shared services that underlies all aspects of SD 7. The suggested initiatives will reduce risk for UMS through improved employee development, policy development, wellness programming, pre-employment background checks, and an updated compensation program for hourly employees. Nationally there have been well documented returns-on-investment in areas such as employee development and wellness. The recommendation regarding procedures for approval of higher level salaries will streamline work at both the campus and System levels and improve our ability to move quickly in recruiting the best qualified candidates. In addition to these specific initiatives, we recommend that the Human Resources and Equal Opportunity directors be charged with continuing to plan for process improvements, greater integration across the System, and a comprehensive program of human resources development and management for UMS. This will enable and empower the human resources function to fully contribute to UMS as a strategic partner.
### Strategic Direction - 7

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Little employee investment (1-10 employees) <strong>Medium</strong> - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees) <strong>High</strong> - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Less than $250,000 <strong>Medium</strong> - $250,000 to $1 million <strong>High</strong> - $1 million and above</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - One time <strong>Medium</strong> - 2007 <strong>High</strong> - 2012 and later</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Staff empowered to make decisions <strong>Medium</strong> - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement <strong>High</strong> - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Employee Development Steering Committee (includes campus HR directors, SWS Employee Development Coordinator (proposed position), Chief HR and OD Officer</td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employee Development Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UMS should adopt an integrated model for delivering employee development programs to optimize organizational effectiveness by minimizing risks and maximizing employee growth, contributions, and career satisfaction. Using this model, each university should implement a core program of supervisor development and a targeted level of employee development for all regular employees.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Element</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>1.5 added FTE, support costs for equipment, travel, materials, stipends for program presenters.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Report - Strategic Direction 7

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

Centralize the System's business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

#### Recommendations

**Design and implement a new classification program for hourly paid employees to include tie to labor market as well as internal equity and to reflect changes to work and technology, in order to improve ability to recruit, reward, and retain qualified workforce.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Less than $250,000</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - 2007</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>System and University HR and EEO leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> - 2008-2011</td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong> - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> - $1 million and above</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> - 2012 and later</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Time Element** - One time
2. **Time Element** - Ongoing

**Low** - Less than $25,000
**Medium** - $25,000 to $1 million
**High** - $1 million and above

**Low** - Low employee investment (1-10 employees)
**Medium** - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)
**High** - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)

**Time Frame**

1. **Time Frame** - One time
2. **Time Frame** - Ongoing

**Low** - 2007
**Medium** - 2008-2011
**High** - 2012 and later

**Low** - Staff empowered to make decisions
**Medium** - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement
**High** - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement

**Leaders**

Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation

**Priority**

Rank in order of importance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Low - System and University HR and EEO leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Report - Strategic Direction 7**

Centralize the System's business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

UMS should further analyze the feasibility of creating a compensation/classification team reporting to the System Office to provide consistent, high quality compensation and classification services to all universities (begin with a pilot project or phase-in).

**7.3**

**LOW** 7.5 FTE classification and compensation staff plus 1 FTE support staff. This reflects an FTE of 1 above the current level of staffing. However, fractions of FTE at smaller campuses cannot be reallocated to this team, so it might require adding 2-2.5 FTE. Savings from specialized, centralized staff to be realized over time and will allow team to take on added work related to revised compensation programs.

**LOW** Up to 2.5 FTE's plus marginal costs of travel, technology, operating costs, etc.

**LOW** initiate in FY07 and roll out in FY08

**MEDIUM** System and University HR and EEO leaders
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### Strategic Direction - 7

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>HR, Public Safety, Environmental Health, and Student Affairs Directors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Senior Management -- Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>University Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>LOW - Broad training and communication needed</td>
<td>LOW - ongoing training and communication needs</td>
<td>LOW - Board approval required</td>
<td>HIGH - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>UMS Chief HR Officer -- HR and EEO Directors -- University Counsel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft policies on Violence in the Workplace, Domestic Violence in the Workplace and Weapons on Campus should be thoroughly reviewed at the campus and System level and submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval.

A system-wide policy on background checks should be developed and implemented consistently within UMS based on identified risk factors.
## Final Report - Strategic Direction 7

### HUMAN RESOURCES

**Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>UMS should continue expansion of the wellness program using the moderately centralized model currently deployed. Under this model, significant support in the form of communications, reporting, program development, funding and coordination are provided by a system-wide resource.</td>
<td>LOW assuming current resources remain available</td>
<td>LOW - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>MEDIUM need senior management support throughout the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>LOW - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>LOW - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 1 - One time</td>
<td>MEDIUM need senior management support throughout the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>MEDIUM - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - One time</td>
<td>MEDIUM need senior management support throughout the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>HIGH - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - One time</td>
<td>Time Element 2 - One time</td>
<td>MEDIUM need senior management support throughout the system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MEDIUM** on most specific recommendations; however, this is an ongoing long term investment with no end date.

- **LOW** would like to see some increased investment by universities over time in the areas of increased flexibility of hours and financial encouragement to participate in programs.
### Recommendations

**Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.**

#### Human Resource Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Employee Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>(1-10 employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>(10-25 employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(More than 25 employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Low**: Little employee investment.  
- **Medium**: Moderate employee investment.  
- **High**: Significant employee investment.

#### Financial Cost

- **Low**: Less than $250,000
- **Medium**: $250,000 to $1 million
- **High**: $1 million and above

#### Time Frame

- **Low**: One time
- **Medium**: On-going
- **High**: On-going

#### Complexity of Implementation

- **Low**: Staff empowered to make decisions
- **Medium**: Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement
- **High**: Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement

#### Leaders

- Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation

#### Priority

- Rank in order of importance

---

**Update and streamline the process for Chancellor approval of high salaries to expedite hiring while maintaining fiduciary oversight. The salary level requiring Chancellor approval should be increased to at least $75,000 and adjusted annually, indexed to across-the-board increases.**

The following categories of salary adjustments should be added to exceptions not requiring approval of the Chancellor: Position reclassification as a result of a change in job responsibilities that results in an increase to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the increase is 10% or less of the current salary base; payment of a long-term stipend for an academic year or longer which is added to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the stipend is 10% or less of the current base salary.

**NOTE:** Priorities are in three tiers: Priorities 1 - 4 will provide the greatest incremental value added and risk reduction for UMS and should be addressed immediately. Priorities 5 and 6 have a longer-term return on investment. Priority 7 is important and can be accomplished with little cost.
University of Maine System
Strategic Direction 7, Human Resources
Budget for Recommendations
May 2006

**Recommendation 7.1 Employee Development**

**On-going Costs at System level**
Provide coordination for employee development at the System level to enable the sharing of resources and economies of scale across the System.

Add Employee Development Coordinator at System Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated salary</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, supplies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 FTE Administrative Support</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $110,960

**Costs to deliver institute at each university**

- Estimated cost per participant (food, materials, etc, for 10 module program): $100 per participant
- Presenter fees and travel – will vary depending on availability of campus resources. $300 - $500 plus travel per presenter

Other resources to be provided by universities include time of existing staff to present employee development programs and to provide logistics and materials support. A significant effort will be required at the university level, but the System-wide coordination and program development will substantially reduce the cost and effort at each university.

**Recommendation 7.2 Hourly Employees Classification and Compensation Program**

**One-time costs – Two-year period**

**Project Director**
- Salary: $70,000
- Benefits: 30,100

**Administrative Support Staff**
- Salary: 24,000
- Benefits: 10,320

**Operating costs**
- Equipment: 5,000
- Space: 3,000
- Travel: 3,000

**Annual total** $142,420

**Two-year total**: $284,840
Other resources to be provided by universities include time of existing staff (especially those who work in classification and compensation) to assist with program development, carry out the data collection, and participate in job evaluations and appeals. A significant effort will be required at the university level, but the System-wide coordination and program development will substantially reduce the cost and effort at each university.

### Ongoing Costs

A new classification and compensation program tied to the labor market and reflecting current work demands will point out needs for increased wage levels to attract and retain hourly paid employees. Based on limited data available we estimate that it would cost $3.6 million to bring hourly paid employees to levels equal to the mid-point of State of Maine pay scales for similar positions, or $1.3 million to bring them to 95% of the State mid-point.

*The cost of wage adjustments does not result from adopting a new compensation program. The proposed program is a tool to insure that added costs of wages are invested where most needed to provide competitive, equitable compensation. Whether or not a new program is adopted, UMS has a stated goal to bring salaries and wages to levels that are competitive in the relevant labor markets (See Strategic Direction 2). The investment in higher wage levels will have a greater return if wages are determined in accordance with an updated classification program.*

There will be a need for ongoing maintenance of the classification and compensation program, including compiling labor market data, updating classification descriptions, and conducting position reviews. This work would be accomplished by the UMS Classification and Compensation team proposed in Recommendation 7.3.

### Recommendation 7.3 Classification and Compensation Team

#### Ongoing Costs

We estimate a team of 8.5 staff (7.5 specialists and 1.0 support staff) would be needed to conduct classification and compensation work for UMS, including support for the Salaried Employees Classification and Compensation Program (SECCP) and the proposed Hourly Employees Classification and Compensation Program (HECCP). Approximately 7.5 staff throughout the System currently conduct this work, but the current staff level is not adequate to keep up with work demands. It is not feasible to simply reassign the existing 7.5 FTE to the System team because at smaller universities this represents a small proportion of one employee’s time. In order to set up the team it would likely be necessary to add 2 full-time positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Classification and Compensation Specialists</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 Administrative Support Position</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs (space, equipment, travel, supplies, etc.)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual total</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 7.4 Policies on Violence in the Workplace, Domestic Violence in the Workplace, and Weapons on Campus

Costs of adopting the policies are minimal. Once policies are adopted, communication and training must be conducted. For a small added expense these policies can be incorporated into employee orientation, annual communications, employee and supervisor handbooks, the Supervisor Development Institute program (see recommendation 7.1), and student handbooks. Universities that conduct additional training will have some additional costs for design and delivery.

Recommendation 7.5 Background Checks

Ongoing costs

A policy requiring background checks will require a modest effort for existing staff, primarily in HR. The larger added cost is likely to be the expense to have background checks conducted by outside vendors.

The costs of background checks will vary significantly depending on the scope of checks to be conducted. For example, conducting criminal record and pre-employment physical examinations for all employees would be very expensive. However, if the policy is tailored so that each kind of screening is applied only to high risk positions, the cost will be considerably less. The group charged with developing this policy should be directed to carefully review the costs and balance the cost and benefit of each type of background check.

Recommendation 7.6 Wellness Program

An increased investment in employee wellness over time would be beneficial. No specific added cost items have been identified for the immediate future.

Recommendation 7.7 and 7.8 Salary Approval Process

No added costs have been identified. Adoption of these recommendations will result in reduced staff time for preparing and processing requests for approval.
### Strategic Direction 7
#### Human Resources

#### 7.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Metric Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do supervisors demonstrate (as measured qualitatively and/or quantitatively) increased confidence, knowledge, and effectiveness in carrying out their supervisory responsibilities as a result of supervisor development programs?</td>
<td>Participating supervisors; managers of participating supervisors; campus and System Office HR, EO, Safety and Environmental, and Loss Prevention directors; University Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do employees demonstrate (as measured qualitatively and/or quantitatively) increased confidence, knowledge, and effectiveness in carrying out their responsibilities and greater career satisfaction as a result of employee development programs?</td>
<td>Participating employees, supervisors of participating employees, campus HR and EO directors, System Office HR managers and University Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the number and effectiveness of employee performance assessments completed by supervisors increased?</td>
<td>Campus and System HR directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have complaints/grievances/lawsuits and/or adverse judgments declined?</td>
<td>Campus and System HR and EEO Directors; University Counsel, Safety/Environmental/Loss Prevention Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Metric Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a project plan in place to develop and implement a revised classification and compensation program for hourly paid employees?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are adequate resources in place to carry out the project plan?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the revised classification and compensation program incorporate relevant labor market data and flexibility in hiring rates?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the revised classification and compensation program reflect the UMS compensation philosophy and incorporate internal equity, external competitiveness, compliance with laws and regulations and a total compensation perspective?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Equal Opportunity Directors, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers, Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have resources been identified to implement the revised program, including any wage adjustments?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the revised program provide an effective mechanism for reclassification, creation of new classifications, and maintenance of the underlying program?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Equal Opportunity Directors, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers, Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have employees and collective bargaining units been appropriately involved in the program development and implementation?</td>
<td>Employees, collective bargaining agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program perceived to be equitable and fair?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Equal Opportunity Directors, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers, Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program result in improved ability to hire and retain well qualified employees?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Equal Opportunity Directors, Presidents, Chief Financial Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Metric Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Has a plan to implement a classification and compensation team been developed that will result in improved quality and efficiency of work and that will have the confidence of employees and managers?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Equal Opportunity Officers, Chief Financial Officers, Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Has the time between submission of a reclassification review and its completion been reduced?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Are there fewer appeals, grievances, and overturned decisions regarding classification decisions?</td>
<td>Records of appeals, grievances, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Does the classification and compensation team have the confidence of employees and managers?</td>
<td>Employees, managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Are there fewer equal opportunity complaints regarding compensation?</td>
<td>Records of EO complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Are adequate resources in place to support the classification and compensation team?</td>
<td>Campus HR Director, classification and compensation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendation

Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

7.3 UMS should further analyze the feasibility of creating a compensation/classification team reporting to the System Office to provide consistent, high quality compensation and classification services to all universities (begin with a pilot project or phase-in).
7.4 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

7.4 Draft Policies on Violence in the Workplace, Domestic Violence and Weapons on Campus to be thoroughly reviewed at the campus and System level and submitted to Trustees for approval

Performance Metric Questions

► Have campus comments on the draft policies been received and addressed? SD 7 Sub-committee

► Has the Board of Trustees adopted the policies? Clerk of the Board of Trustees

► Have campuses implemented institution-specific policies and procedures? HR Directors and CSAOs

► Has awareness of these issues on campus increased through training and communication? CAOs, CSAOs, Employees, Students

► Are violence-related incidents reported and addressed? HR and EEO Directors, Public Safety
Strategic Direction 7
Human Resources
7.5 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommended: Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

Recommendation

7.5 A system-wide policy on background checks should be developed and implemented consistently within UMS based on identified risk factors.

Performance Metric Questions

- Have all the campuses implemented the background check policy and appropriately educated hiring officials so that the policy is applied fairly and consistently?
  - Campus and System HR Directors, University Counsel

- Does the process produce information that is relevant to the hiring process and that minimizes risk to the University of Maine System?
  - Campus and System HR Directors, University Counsel

- Is the process being conducted in an administratively efficient and cost effective manner?
  - Campus and System HR Directors, University Counsel, survey of hiring managers
### Performance Metric Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◀ Has a supportive employee health and wellness environment been created at all major university locations?</td>
<td>Employees (through survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Has senior management understanding and support been obtained?</td>
<td>Employees (through survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Have employee programs been designed and implemented supported by data with specific targeted measurable objectives?</td>
<td>System-wide Health Improvement Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Has employee absenteeism been reduced?</td>
<td>Campus and System HR Directors; absence recon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

- Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

**7.6 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE**

- Recommendation: UMS should continue expansion of the wellness program using the moderately centralized model currently deployed. Under this model, significant support in the form of communications, reporting, program development, funding and coordination are provided by a system-wide resource.
7.7 Update and streamline the process for Chancellor approval of high salaries to expedite hiring while maintaining fiduciary oversight. The salary level requiring Chancellor approval should be increased to at least $75,000 and adjusted annually, indexed to across-the-board increases. Additional categories of salary adjustments which would not require Chancellor approval are also recommended. (See recommendation 7.7.)

**Performance Metric Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the number of requests requiring Chancellor approval declined?</td>
<td>System HR Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the number of requests received in campus HR offices which no longer need Chancellor approval increased?</td>
<td>Campus HR Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the adjustment to salary level been annually indexed to across the board increases?</td>
<td>System HR Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategic Direction #7 – THESIS
Final Report

Strategic Direction 7: Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

Executive Summary

The THESIS project has been on a different timeline than most of the rest of the UMS Strategic Plan. An implementation plan, developed with assistance from Thundercloud Consulting, was presented to the Board of Trustees in May 2005. Since then we have undertaken the first stages of actual implementation with assistance from Cedar Crestone and funding from the Davis Foundation. An update was provided to the Board of Trustees in January 2006. Since that time, implementation teams have continued working on the main two facets of the project: 1) a shared processing center (initially for the processing of admissions applications; later to assume a range of other functions); 2) campus-level “one-stops” to provide a variety of integrated student services. We anticipate to “go live” with the Processing Center in Fall 2006. Some of the campus one-stops will also begin operation in the fall, with others phasing in as necessary changes to facilities are made. All facets of the THESIS project are being supported by parallel and complementary implementations of new enterprise software products, document management, and workforce management plans.

Final Recommendations Grid

(see attachment)

Note 1: Except for Recommendation 7.6, none of the reported items truly qualify any more as recommendations. They have been approved and are in the process of implementation.

Note 2: Given that the seven primary recommendations are all necessary parts of a single comprehensive project, it did not make sense to rank them in terms of priority or importance.

Assessment

There are four important pieces to the assessment of THESIS:

1) Processing Center: Is the business case adequate? Are the plans sufficiently complete for a fall 2006 go-live? These questions will be answered via an external evaluation by a consultant. That report will be reviewed in late May/early June, 2006, by the Sponsors, Steering Committee, and Presidents.
2) Processing Center: What is the quality of service provided to students and secondarily to guidance counselors and secondary schools? What is the quality of service provided to campus operations (e.g., admissions)? Are overall costs reduced? Methods for assessment and oversight are being developed by Center leadership along with process liaisons (initially from campus Admissions operations), with eventual review by the project Sponsors and Steering Committee.

3) Campus One-Stops: Is each campus ready for go-live? This will require assessments of facilities renovations, personnel preparation, technological tools, policies and procedures, etc.

4) Campus One-Stops: What is the quality of service provided to students? Most importantly, are they provided correct information along with timely problem solving? Is the need for referrals reduced? What is the level of student satisfaction? Secondarily, are there any budgetary savings? Each campus will develop appropriate methodologies for assessment.

Budget

(See the THESIS Business Case developed in February 2006)

Summary

The initial implementation planning for THESIS, undertaken in 2004-05, resulted in process maps for all the relevant student service areas. Processes were categorized as “above-the-line” (needing to remain on campuses) and “below-the-line” (back office processes that can reasonably be centralized). That analysis was endorsed by the Presidents and presented to the Trustees; it defines an eventual destination (although modifications are certainly possible, and some have already surfaced as potential recommendations from the Steering Committee).

The actual implementation of THESIS is proceeding in phases, with the initial launch of a Shared Processing Center (in Orono) and several Campus One-Stop Student Service Centers scheduled for fall 2006. Preparations for launch of the Processing Center are being guided by a Critical Path Checklist, with oversight by a Sponsors group and a Steering Committee that has representation from all seven campuses. An external consultant will evaluate go-live readiness. Based on that report, the Steering Committee and Sponsors will make a recommendation to the Chancellor and Presidents. A final decision is expected in June 2006.

The Center will initially focus on one area of responsibility—the processing of admissions applications and related materials. Loan collections and archiving/scanning will follow. The timetable for moving other “below the line” processes to the Center is flexible. Furthermore, coordinated or centralized operations will probably not in all cases require physical relocation of employees or their work to the Center itself.
The financial plan for THESIS specifies both start-up costs and estimated eventual cost avoidance. However, the calculation of savings is far from an exact science. This will have to be monitored. The savings will be greater on some campuses, less on others. Whether any savings are realized at all at the campus level will also depend on the methodology developed by the CFO’s and Chief Financial Officer for cost-sharing by the universities. The costs in the initial start-up year are being covered by the Central Office from reserves.

Overall THESIS planning has been fully integrated with Project Enterprise planning. The latter has involved developing new software tools and working to align processes and policies with those tools; the former has involved larger-scale business process redesign to improve overall service, create efficiencies, and remove costs. Both have been extremely labor intensive. With limited resources and in most cases no back-fill for the campuses, the projects have created enormous strain and many unmeasured costs. The gains are longer term and at present mostly unrealized, albeit promised.
## Recommendations

**Human Resource Requirement**
- **Low**: Little employee investment (1-10 employees)
- **Medium**: Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)
- **High**: Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)

**Financial Cost**
- **Low**: Less than $250,000
- **Medium**: $250,000 to $1 million
- **High**: $1 million and above

**Time Frame**
- **Low**: One time
- **Medium**: One time
- **High**: One time

**Complexity of Implementation**
- **Low**: Staff empowered to make decisions
- **Medium**: Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement
- **High**: Legislature, Board, Chancellor, and Presidential involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Time Element</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Complete work on identified differences in policies and procedures (standardizing wherever possible; maintaining differences wherever critical to mission differentiation) in order to proceed with timely PeopleSoft implementation and THESIS reorganization.</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Steering Committee, CAO's, CFO's</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Complete the planning for business process redesign, reconfigured job descriptions, training, facilities renovations, and assessment that will allow campus One-Stops to begin operating in fall 2006 (with the understanding that local circumstances may dictate only a partial emergence and gradual evolution in subsequent semesters at some universities).</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Varies by campus</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Campus One-Stop Directors and Administrative Leadership</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Complete the business case and financial planning models for the Back Office Processing Center to provide needed context for ongoing UMS and university budget planning.</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Steering Committee; Sponsors; Review by Presidents</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Complete the design and implementation planning (including plans for oversight, accountability mechanisms, and assessment) for a first-generation Center, which will begin operation in fall 2006, and coordinate with implementation planning for document management, CRM, electronic payment, etc.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Center Director, Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Coordinate One-Stop and Center planning with completion of a workforce management policy and plans.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>UMS Staff; Steering Committee; Sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Develop potential scenarios and timelines for later stages of Center development.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Center Director; Steering Committee; Sponsors; Review by Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Develop powerful, user-friendly, web-based self-service options for students and advisors.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High (but mostly spent already)</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Project Enterprise Leadership; Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategic Direction #7 – Information Technology – Final Report

Strategic Direction 7 – Central the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

Executive Summary

The second report submitted in December 2005 provided a broader approach to Information Technology across the University of Maine System than did the previous report (June 2005). A new goal was established, and strategies to achieve the goal were outlined. This update focuses on final recommendations to meet the goal, while acknowledging the significant work that will be required beyond this summer both to achieve the goal and to implement the identified strategies.

The Goal: Establish and maintain a robust flexible, secure, and manageable information technology infrastructure in the University of Maine system that
- supports and enables education, public service, and research
- provides services and information to students, faculty, and staff any time on any device (desktops, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, etc.)
- enables the University System to employ 21st century technology to become and remain competitive with other higher education institutions both regionally and nationally.

The Strategies and Recommendations: Assess the status of the IT infrastructure on each campus and at the System office (Strategy #2).

This work is still in progress, but based on campus and system input, a significant investment is required to modernize each campus network to current standards. This coincides with rebuilding the IT system and state network with next-generation technology that will allow us to provide the services and capacity required for UMS to be competitive with other institutions in the Northeast.

It is estimated that the capital funding will be in the range of $25 - $30M over the next three years. It is expected that over the next three to five years there will continue to be a convergence of voice, video and data networks into a single infrastructure that will support all three.

The importance of this requirement cannot be minimized, as the network supports all of the core missions of the University of Maine System and all of the Strategic Directions contained in the Plan. This investment is critical to creating new learning environments, expanding research and providing on-line self-service for students, faculty and staff. It should be considered mandatory given the state’s need to attract students and faculty from within and outside of Maine.

It is recommended that the University System consider investing the following amounts in:
   a. Research IT infrastructure – The current infrastructure has been built with grant funds. We expect that future grants will require us to match or have a strong base capability. $1.0 - $2.0M required.
   b. Instructional Technology (classroom and at a distance) – There is a need to support Strategic Directions #2 and #3 with an array of technologies that center on creating active learner-centered environments for current and future students. Technologies such as virtual reality, digital gaming, video streaming, pod-casting and many others hold substantial potential for the University System. $1.0M required.

The other three strategies outlined in the December 2005 report will continue to be pursued, but the above recommendations are of the highest priority at this time.
### Recommendations

Centralize the System's business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Element</td>
<td>Time Element</td>
<td>Time Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td>1 - One time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - On-going</td>
<td>2 - On-going</td>
<td>2 - On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establish and maintain a robust, flexible, secure, and manageable information technology infrastructure in the University of Maine System that:

1. **Supports and enables education, public service, and research**
   - High - More than 25 employees
   - High $25 - $30M
   - Medium if funding provided

2. **Provides services and information to students, faculty, and staff any time on any device (desktops, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, etc.)**
   - High - More than 25 employees
   - High $2-3$M
   - Medium if funding provided

3. **Enables the University System to employ 21st century technology to become and remain competitive with other higher education institutions both regionally and nationally.**
   - High - More than 25 employees
   - High Total of 7.1 & 7.2 $27-$33M
   - Medium if funding provided
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## Final Report - Strategic Direction 9

### ADVOCACY

**Objectives:** Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assess what resources will be available to develop a comprehensive state-wide (and beyond) communications and advocacy program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>System Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **9.2A** | **Create a campaign focused on the value of a baccalaureate and graduate degrees to the individual and to the state of Maine. Highlight opportunities available in Maine through our public universities** |
| | Medium | Medium - $400,000 to $800,000/Year | 1. Low - begin spring 06, and 2. run annually for 5 yrs | Medium | System and campus PR Staff plus presidents | 1 |

| **9.2B** | **Establish the Public Universities of Maine brand. Consider changing the collective label to the Public Universities of Maine, or Maine's Public Universities. This goal emerged from the Marketing Committee as well** |
| | as above | ad above | as above | as above | as above | 1 |

| **9.2C** | **Build a sense of “public ownership” of Maine’s Public Universities** |
| | as above | as above | as above | as above | as above | 1 |
### Strategic Direction - 9

**ADVOCACY**

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.2D Promote the quality aspects emerging through all elements of the System Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>System PR Staff and Campus CAO's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>System PR Staff and Campus CAO's + presidents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>System and Campus PR Staffs plus presidents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2E Help employers to understand the important role their public universities plan in educating the future workforce of Maine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>System PR Staff and Campus CAO's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Update the central website to provide a complete inventory of institutions and academic programs available. Generate attractive printed materials with this same information</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>System PR Staff and Campus CAO's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Create a television campaign that depicts and promotes the “open doors” and the high quality of Maine’s Public Universities. Through visitor’s Centers and other mechanisms, make people feel the same way about Maine’s Public Universities as they do about their local high schools</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2. Multi-Year</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>System and Campus PR Staffs plus presidents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Direction - 9

**ADVOCACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels,</td>
<td>Amount of money</td>
<td>Length of</td>
<td>Level and complexity of</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expertise and time</td>
<td>required to</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>bureaucracy required to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commitment required to</td>
<td>implement</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>implement recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implement recommendation</td>
<td>recommendation</td>
<td>implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.5</strong> Create an “Aspirations” Recruiting Campaign focused on the value of</td>
<td>Low - Little employee</td>
<td>Low - Less than</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to</td>
<td>System and Campus PR Staffs plus presidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher education (through Maine’s Public Universities) as an outreach to:</td>
<td>investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>$250,000 to $1</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>make decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Students, High Schools</td>
<td>Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>million</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students including both “college bound” and those not so certain, and a</td>
<td>High - Significant employee</td>
<td>$1 million and</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
<td>multi-campus administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>component encouraging current undergraduate students to consider graduate</td>
<td>investment (More than 25</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>2012 and</td>
<td>involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs. Another video could highlight the many exciting summer programs and</td>
<td>employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td>later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camps (sports, culture and so on) that take place on our campuses</td>
<td>Time Element 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor and Presidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2. Multi-Year</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - $1 million and above</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to $1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 1</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - More than 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td>make decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multi-campus administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor and Presidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - Little employee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2. Ongoing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.6</strong> Conduct market research to verify where we are and where we want to be</td>
<td>Low - Moderate employee</td>
<td>Low - Annual</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>System and Campus PR Staffs plus presidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every two years. The information obtained would be used to guide the various</td>
<td>investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaigns detailed above</td>
<td>Time Element 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2. Ongoing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - Significant employee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investment (More than 25</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.7</strong> Profile outstanding faculty at Maine’s Public Universities</td>
<td>Low - Little employee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Campus and System PR Staffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Element 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.**
### Strategic Direction - 9
#### ADVOCACY

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore other media such as signage on trucks, buses and public transportation</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Campus and System PR Staffs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a focused campaign for Maine’s Public Universities targeted to corporations and foundations that may operate in state but have headquarters elsewhere</td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>Campus Development Staffs plus Presidents and Chancellor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch an information/awareness campaign highlighting the importance of charitable giving to public higher education. This might involve testimonials from donors at all levels and from all institutions</td>
<td>Medium - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $1 million and above</td>
<td>Low - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td>Campus Dev and PR Staffs, System PR Staff, Presidents and Chancellor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the support needed to upgrade the current donor database management system to a usable system</td>
<td>Medium - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>Low - Meetings in Progress</td>
<td>Low - 2012 and later</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>Development Staffs plus Presidents and Chancellor/CFO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Report - Strategic Direction 9

Strategic Direction - 9 ADVOCACY

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities' individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.12 Support ongoing campus efforts: Insure that the central website is up to date and effective for donors; Market the existing Charitable Gift Annuity Program more aggressively and more routinely; Facilitate professional development for fund raising personnel</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1. Low and 2. Ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13 Host a senior level Development Advisory Council to meet periodically with System Staff personnel. They could explore opportunities for collaboration and cooperation as well as mutual support, in areas such as training and professional development</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1. Low and 2. Ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14 Develop a small campaign targeted to a few major firms in or out of state that may wish to support all of Maine’s public Universities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2. Multi-Year</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Low** - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)
- **Medium** - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)
- **High** - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)

**Time Element**
- 1 - One time
- 2 - Ongoing

**Financial Cost**
- Low - Less than $250,000
- Medium - $250,000 to $1 million
- High - $1 million and above

**Time Frame**
- Low - 2007
- Medium - 2008-2011
- High - 2012 and later

**Leaders**
- Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation

**Priority**
- Rank in order of importance
Strategic Direction 9
Advocacy
9.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

9.1 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.1 Assess what resources will be available to develop a comprehensive state-wide (and beyond) communications and advocacy program

Performance Metric Questions

Do we have an inventory of data availability and financial resources which can be allocated to support the attainment of these objectives?

Assessment:
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9.2A ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

**Recommendation**

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.2A Create a campaign focused on the value of a baccalaureate and graduate degrees to the individual and to the state of Maine. Highlight opportunities available in Maine through our public universities.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Can we conduct Market Research to assess the level of name recognition for the System Campuses and monitor changes in the level of recognition due to our visibility campaign?

- Are we measuring through Admissions Processes, changes in Inquiries, Applications and Enrollments as a result of Visibility Campaign?

- Can we document increased enrollments from the areas to which the Visibility Campaign was targeted?

- Are we backing up our research with Phone Surveys? Focus groups on campus?

Assessment:
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9.2B ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

► Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.2B Establish the Public Universities of Maine brand. Consider changing the collective label to the Public Universities of Maine, or Maine’s Public Universities. This goal emerged from the Marketing Committee as well

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

► These are all part of 9.2A Campaign

►

►

►

►

►

►

►
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9.2C ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.2C Build a sense of “public ownership” of Maine's Public Universities

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

- These are all part of 9.2A Campaign

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

-
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9.2D ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

9.2D Promote the quality aspects emerging through all elements of the System Strategic Plan

Performance Metric Questions

- These are all part of 9.2A Campaign

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

-
Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

**Recommendation**

9.2E Help employers to understand the important role their public universities plan in educating the future workforce of Maine

**Performance Metric Questions**

- These are all part of 9.2A Campaign
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9.3 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

 Recommendation

9.3 Update the central website to provide a complete inventory of institutions and academic programs available. Generate attractive printed materials with this same information.

Performance Metric Questions

► Has the Site been Updated and is it Operating to our Satisfaction?

► Are we measuring Hits? By Campus?

► Are we monitoring increased Inquiries, Applications and Enrollments attributable to the Sites?
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9.4 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.4 Create a television campaign that depicts and promotes the "open doors" and the high quality of Maine’s Public Universities. Through visitor’s Centers and other mechanisms, make people feel the same way about Maine’s Public Universities as they do about their local high schools.

Performance Metric Questions

- Are we Assessing Public Awareness and Name Recognition through Professional Market Research?
- Are we monitoring Increases in Inquiries, Applications and Enrollments attributable to the Television Campaign?
- Are we monitoring increases in College Going Rates in general for the state of Maine, and are we assessing our fair share of changes?
- Are we monitoring on each campus changes in enrollments attributed by students to the Television Campaign?
- Are we utilizing the feedback from Market Research to refine and redirect the Campaign as the Data Suggest?
- Are we seeing an increase in private philanthropic support to our institutions and similar public support for appropriations and bond issues supporting Maine’s Public Universities?
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9.5 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.5 Create an “Aspirations” Recruiting Campaign focused on the value of higher education (through Maine’s Public Universities) as an outreach to: Middle School Students, High Schools Students including both “college bound” and those not so certain, and a component encouraging current undergraduate students to consider graduate programs. Another video could highlight the many exciting summer programs and camps (sports, culture and so on) that take place on our campuses.

Performance Metric Questions

- Are we measuring and monitoring student Inquiries, Applications and Enrollments at all postsecondary education and our market share of those going on to higher education?
- Are we conducting Market Research and Monitoring changes in Inquiries, Applications and Enrollments at member universities from the areas where the Campaign is targeted?
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9.6 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

- 9.6 Conduct market research to verify where we are and where we want to be every two years. The information obtained would be used to guide the various campaigns detailed above.

Performance Metric Questions

- Are we making proper use of Market Research to design, guide, monitor and evaluate Visibility, Recruiting, Television and other Campaigns as appropriate?

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

- 

-
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9.7 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Navigate to "Recommendation"

9.7 Profile outstanding faculty at Maine’s Public Universities

Performance Metric Questions

- Are we using Market Research to monitor the impact of these profiles?
- Are we Insuring that all System Universities are appropriately represented?
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9.8 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

- 9.8 Explore other media such as signage on trucks, buses and public transportation

### Performance Metric Questions

- Are we utilizing appropriate Market Research to determine the best outlets to reach our target markets (high school students, non traditional students, guidance counselors and other “influencers”)?

- Are we experimenting with "outside the box" channels for reaching our markets? Are we evaluating the success of every channel utilizing appropriate market research?
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9.9 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.9 Consider a focused campaign for Maine’s Public Universities targeted to corporations and foundations that may operate in state but have headquarters elsewhere

Performance Metric Questions

► Are we working with Senior Development Personnel and Presidents to determine whether a significant market exists for state-wide or national firms that might prefer a single gift to assist all seven campuses?

► Have we assessed the potential for gifts from these sources?

► Should we consider a formal "Feasibility Study" to assess the size and scope of this market?

Recommendation

Recommendation
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9.10 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

- Launch an information/awareness campaign highlighting the importance of charitable giving to public higher education. This might involve testimonials from donors at all levels and from all institutions.

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

- Have we utilized appropriate market research to determine how best to reach the market of potential donors?

- Are we monitoring increases in giving at all seven institutions and can we identify new or increased donors who attribute their gifts to such a campaign?
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9.11 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.11 Provide the support needed to upgrade the current donor data base management system to a usable system

Performance Metric Questions

- Have we reviewed the market to determine best candidates to provide truly state-of-the-art donor software?

- Have we invited the top firms to submit proposals and present demonstrations to Development Personnel?

- Have we evaluated Candidates and Reviewed Capability, Costs, and Track Record?
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9.12 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

► Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.12 Support ongoing campus efforts: Insure that the central website is up to date and effective for donors; Market the existing Charitable Gift Annuity Program more aggressively and more routinely; Facilitate professional development for fund raising personnel.

Performance Metric Questions

► Is the central website up to date and is it designed to provide useful and easy updates to campus sites?

► Are materials and websites geared to facilitate direct contact with individual campuses as quickly and as easily as possible?

► Do marketing efforts for programs like Charitable Gift Annuities focus on gifts to individual campuses?

► Are we tracking hits on the system site to monitor transition to the campuses? Do we see increasing numbers?

► Are campuses experiencing increased use of their sites through this vehicle?

► Are we monitoring numbers of Gift Annuities, and are they increasing?

► Are Fund-Raising Activities on all Campuses achieving greater success each year? Can we bring in outside speakers and host workshops to assist all as we did for Academic Advising?
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9.13 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.13 Host a senior level Development Advisory Council to meet periodically with System Staff personnel. They could explore opportunities for collaboration and cooperation as well as mutual support, in areas such as training and professional development.

Performance Metric Questions

- Do Senior Advancement/Development Officers meet routinely through System sponsored events? How frequently?

- Have we canvassed Senior Development Officers and Presidents to assess their needs in Development support?

- Are system efforts in Advancement supporting/supplementing the work of Development Professionals on campus? To what extent?
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9.14 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

- Develop a coordinated, collaborative approach to University advancement and advocacy in ways that increase public understanding of the mission, value, and benefits of Maine’s public universities; and enhance the universities’ individual and collective appeal, reputation, financial resources, and public support.

9.14 Develop a small campaign targeted to a few major firms in or out of state that may wish to support all of Maine’s public Universities

Performance Metric Questions

- Have Presidents and Chief Development Officers identified any prospects for such a campaign? Are such campaigns conducted in other states? How successful are they?

- Before raising the funds, has an agreed upon formula for distribution been established? Does it include equal shares, shares based on size (enrollment) or a combination of both?

- Does the projected size of the Campaign justify the effort? How will equitable participation by all personnel including presidents be determined and monitored?

- This comment pertains to Objective 9.15 Advocacy Network - Are we assessing legislative response to higher education needs? Is the climate improving? Are Bond Issues Successful? Are appropriations increasing?