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Strategic Direction 1 - Strive for quality across the System and support institutions in achieving their potential through rigorous academic program planning, program realignment throughout the System, and strengthened student services and support.

I. OVERVIEW

Strategic Direction # 1 deals with ensuring both quality in academic programs and access to University of Maine System programs for students of diverse academic backgrounds and experiences. The Committee’s charge is to develop recommendations regarding systematic and inclusive academic program review and planning processes that emphasize quality and collaboration. These processes must recognize Maine students’ needs for access based on highly variable academic experiences and for support services, including financial aid, that ensure these students a credible opportunity to achieve their academic potential. Put another way, the charge is to provide for the greatest possible success for Maine students, thereby raising Maine’s baccalaureate achievement rate. By offering an appropriate array of degree programs of the highest quality and ensuring students academic and financial access to those programs, we enhance our ability to attain the goal.

The Strategic Plan Implementation Planning Process document directs the Strategic Direction # 1 Committee to address goals of clear and appropriate numeric criteria, indices and ratios, and targets relative to program capacity and viability, as well as measures of academic program quality, while still accommodating unique missions and niches. The Committee is further to address appropriate pathways to admission, including articulation among System programs and with the Maine Community College System, and appropriate means for supporting student achievement regardless of path of entry to the System. (See Addendum #1 for alignment of the Committee’s preliminary recommendation with specific goals articulated in the Planning Process document.)

Committee Organization and Work. The Committee, comprised of faculty members, staff members, and students drawn from each of the seven institutions in the University of Maine System, met in session five times over a period of almost four months during the Spring of 2005. The group discussed the charge, considered characteristics of UMS students and their needs, debated merits of various approaches to the charge, and formulated a set of preliminary recommendations to present to the Board of Trustees in June, 2005. The Committee Coordinating Chair requested support from the System Office of Planning and Policy analysis with respect to quantitative measures (Carnegie classifications, faculty ratios, retention and graduation rates, etc.), but staffing was unavailable. Between meetings Committee members interacted as necessary via e-mail
and compressed video. Not all members could participate in every facet of the work, but all were given a chance to respond to meeting agendas and notes. The Committee broke initially into subcommittees that reported findings back to the full Committee, which then worked to prepare the preliminary recommendations reported below. Continued faculty engagement will be crucial to success of implementation of final recommendations.

Discussion. It is impossible to capture fully the richness and depth of the Committee’s discussions or the surprising unanimity of purpose and conviction in its deliberations. That is not to say that everyone agreed to every point of discussion, or that every recommendation below has equal support. It is to say that the Committee’s work was serious and productive.

As Committee members shared thoughts and concerns, the charge and its stated goals became clearer. The Committee re-articulated the charge as addressing academic program review (including planning new programs and eliminating unnecessary ones), issues of academic access (including academic experience and financial wherewithal, but not distance education), and issues of student success (including both financial aid and student services support functions). These three aspects of the Committee’s re-articulated charge became the foci of the work and the bases for establishing subcommittees. As work progressed the Access and Student Success subcommittees were merged.

Among significant points of discussion and agreement that framed the Committee’s preliminary recommendations, the following deserve mention:

Quality/Access. Much of the Committee’s discussion addressed directly or indirectly the tension within public higher education, both nationally and in Maine, between providing high quality and rigorous academic programs and providing a full range of pathways to access those programs. This matter, resulting from the democratization of higher education, is particularly acute in Maine where the State is working to increase baccalaureate achievement within its population without a common State-wide approach to achieving both quality and access. In particular, the Committee feels that the missions and expectations of the State’s K-12 Education System (and Maine Learning Results), the Adult Education System, the Maine Community College System, and the University of Maine System are not well aligned, especially with respect to what students must know to succeed in post-secondary education. The University of Maine System can encourage improved alignment among these otherwise interdependent organizations, but true alignment is a public policy question of the highest order and requires a State-wide response.

A related concern is Financial Aid, a topic the Committee has postponed for the moment as the System awaits the report of Scanell and Kurz Consultants.

The Nature of Our Students. The Committee gave much discussion to understanding the nature of students in the University of Maine System. Not all, even few, of the students who attend System institutions have the preparation of the students with whom many members of the Committee went to college or university. This situation is in part a consequence of the democratization of higher education—a larger proportion
of high school students is graduating, and a larger proportion of high school graduates is attempting post-secondary education, than a decade or two ago. Importantly, evidence suggests that for conventional age students, there is inadequate alignment between student preparation for higher education and the System’s expectations of these students. At the same time, an increasing proportion of students is older than traditional students, come from a diverse set of ethnic backgrounds and experiences, and female—up to 80% at some institutions. Many students also work full time, have significant family responsibilities, or experience significant physical, emotional, or mental health issues. Finally, an increasing proportion also attends more than one institution, even simultaneously, before completing a degree. As a result, and consistent with higher education trends nationally, some System institutions serve and graduate more degree completion students who have transferred in than initial access students.

In short, we must educate the students we have, not the ones we wish to have. On the one hand, students bring extraordinary mixes of backgrounds and life experiences to the classroom. On the other, their preparation and motivation are mixed at best. As a consequence, we must deal responsibly with them with respect to access. That requires us to determine how to respond to their degree of motivation and preparedness, or not admit those who are simply unmotivated or unprepared. Indeed, we must acknowledge that we do not have the capacity to serve some prospective students and then ensure that those students who are admitted seek out and respond to advising and other mechanisms of student success.

Student Success. System institutions have a responsibility to work to ensure student success. Committee members have concluded that the most important goal and measure of quality in academic programs is student success. Student success should be measured in terms of the value added by education—outcomes—relative to student goals, not just input measures (e.g. faculty/student ratios) or progression through higher education (retention and graduation rates). But student success requires significant scaffolding of students due to their varying degrees of motivation and preparedness. It requires not only that we celebrate the educational value of diversity among our students but also accept the educational challenge of that diversity. It requires, as well, attention to such matters as assistive technologies. Given the nature of System students and the policy decision in Maine to delegate developmental work to the UMS, System institutions must attend to remediation where preparation is inadequate. Remediation alone, however, is not sufficient. System institutions must continue to bolster students throughout their educational careers, including financially, or resign themselves and their students to failure.

Focus on Outcomes. Most national rankings of higher education institutions focus on inputs (e.g., faculty/student ratios) to gauge the quality of an institution and its programs, or they focus on a few easily measured outcomes (e.g., retention and graduation rates), which are highly correlated with the preparation of incoming students. Central to assessment of quality is articulation of outcomes and respective measures that address the mission and capacity of System institutions to respond to the nature of our students. Focus on outcomes will effect long-term student success in the K-12 education
system, as System students complete the loop by returning to the K-12 system as teachers to prepare University students of the future.

**Duplication/Uniqueness.** Committee members strongly subscribe to the notion that program alignment within the System must expand beyond the simple, historical “avoidance of duplication.” It must acknowledge uniqueness and niches and support goals of complementarity and collaboration in instructional programming and delivery.

**Review and Planning.** Central to the charge of ensuring quality and access are evaluative program review and planning processes. The System provides a context within which review and planning unfold, but processes must be institution-based and reflect institutions’ missions and capacities. Processes must focus on substance of programs and must address the mission and capacity of programs to respond to the nature of our students. They must demonstrate how programs balance quality with access and work to ensure student success, regardless how that success is defined.

**Faculty Engagement.** Faculty members have responsibility to provide effective instruction and advising. System institutions must value and reward the quality of that instruction and advising, and instruction and advising must be evaluated as a part of program review. Finally, with respect to the question of access, it is clear that faculty members need not lower standards to accommodate the changing nature of students, but work harder, or differently, to ensure that students achieve those standards.

**Fiscal Reality.** Fiscal realities require the System to place the cost of delivering student success programs on students themselves through tuition for remediation and fees to sustain support programs. Fiscal reality also requires us to acknowledge that an important contributor toward student failure is the comparatively high debt burden of Maine students, thus necessitating the development of a coherent and effective financial aid strategy for the System’s institutions.

The Committee’s recommendations follow from the substance of this discussion.

**II. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee offers the following preliminary recommendations for System-wide review and comment before the Committee returns to work in Academic Year 2005-2006. (See Addendum #1 for alignment of these recommendations with the goals articulated in the Implement Planning Process document.)

1. **Take program planning and review seriously and ensure its effectiveness.** In particular:

   *(a) Undertake program review within five years for new programs and at least every seven years for continuing programs, unless a shorter interval is deemed necessary for*
specified conditions resulting from a review. Undertake campus-level processes for programs less than degree-level.

*(b) Ensure broad institutional and community representation in the process of academic program review and planning, including but not limited to community college system faculty and staff, or program alumni. Encourage structures and mechanisms that blend academic affairs and student affairs in a constructive fashion.

*(c) Address complementarity within and collaboration across the System, standards to be met, when and where programs are offered, and mechanisms to provide program access. Review should address explicitly need for continuance or elimination of programs.

*(d) Ensure that institutions and the System fully vet program reviews and provide responses and feedback to programs.

2. Develop a program review process that addresses explicitly student learning outcomes as the bases for program quality and educational value. In particular:

*(a) Assess alignment of student learning outcomes with the nature of students in the program and teaching effectiveness with respect to the student learning outcomes.

*(b) Assess a program’s contribution to general education, as appropriate. Assess general education’s contribution to the program.

*(c) Ensure that program review and planning address program goals for student preparation, access, engagement (such as defined by the National Survey of Student Engagement), and success.

*(d) Evaluate faculty development and instructional improvement/pedagogy that take into account the nature of students and their learning capacities. Ensure that program review and planning address program goals for faculty contributions to student learning.

*(e) Relate information about students, including transfer students, to their experiences and goals. Align evaluation of student progress and retention and graduation rates with the nature of students and their needs. Track students to determine effective retention and graduation rates.

3. Develop and implement a common System-wide set of fundamental general education outcomes upon which each institution build its own approach to general education.

*(a) Develop for general education a program review and planning processes at the System level, and assess the effectiveness of each institution’s general education as related to student learning outcomes.
 *(b) Align evaluation of student progress and retention and graduation rates by institution to reflect the nature of students and their needs.

4. **Extend program review to include the student learning outcomes associated with appropriate developmental, support, and co-curricular programs, such as advising services, placement tests, first-year programs, leadership development, etc.**

5. **Coordinate at the System level to develop cooperative and collaborative means to deliver programs and courses that any one institution may be unable to offer (e.g. “2 plus 2” programs; foreign language instruction).**

6. **Work at the State policy level to align expectations of and for students at the University of Maine System, the Maine Community College System, Adult Education, and the K-12 System.**

   *(a) Build on exemplary work already underway at System institutions to develop effective programs for Early College, common placement exams, and remedial instruction, and report student performance back to originating K-2 systems and the Maine Community College System.*

**III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP**

The Committee’s work intersects significantly with that of each of the other strategic directions:

2. Faculty Development, with respect to instructional improvement, for instance.

3. Distance Education, especially with respect to access and development of “2 plus 2” programs.

4. Libraries and instructional support.

5. Scholarship and its important link to enhancing what faculty members teach relative to learning outcomes and effective instruction.

6. Accountability as an outcome of program review.

7. Centralization (and THESIS) with respect, for instance, to shared fundamentals of general education or common placement exams.

8. Restructuring with respect to balancing access with quality.

9. Advancement with respect to programs to support financial access for students.
Linkage with these other strategic planning committees has to occur primarily through the Chief Academic Officers and Chief Student Affairs Officers.

IV. GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

The Committee will assess responses to its report beginning in the Fall Semester, 2005. From these responses, The Committee will refine the program planning and review processes and provide strategies for System and institutional implementation of recommendations. The Committee must address the quantitative measures indicated as goals in the Strategic Plan as well as “2 plus 2” programs. Outcomes and assessment also require attention. Minimally, specific steps and actions include:

* Learn from and build upon work on alignment and remediation undertaken by Lynn Miller and her committee.

* Convene interested parties to discuss policies related to student expectations, Learning Results, alignment, and remediation. Invite representatives of the System, the Maine Community College System, the Department of Education, the Compact for Higher Education, the Mitchell Institute, and MELMAC.

* Given the nature of students in the System, address development and deployment of “2 plus 2” programs to ensure widespread access to System programs.

* Work with the System Planning and Policy Analysis Office to determine efficacy and utility of various quantitative measures of input and progression relative to an outcomes approach to program assessment.

* Ensure widespread involvement of faculty in on-going discussions leading to final recommendations to the Board of Trustees in March, 2006.

Addendum: Alignment of Strategic Direction # 1 Goals with the Committee’s Preliminary Recommendations

Goal 1. Develop criteria for an Academic Program Planning process that emphasizes quality, is campus-based, and led by faculty, with collaboration between and among campuses as needed. See Preliminary Recommendations 1 (how to undertake program planning and review) and 2 (how to address quality and educational value).

Goal 2. Establish appropriate student/faculty ratios as well as faculty/staff ratios, consistent with the Carnegie classification of each university and its mission.

Goal 3. Set and achieve specific enrollment targets.

Goal 4. Set State-wide minimum standards for retention rates, consistent with the
Goal 5. Set State-wide minimum standards for graduation rates, consistent with the Carnegie classification of each university and its mission. The Committee has made no recommendations related to these goals as stated. In part, the Committee does not have sufficient information with work with. More important, the goals, in effect, are contrary to concerns the Committee has expressed with respect to the nature of the System’s students. Goal 2 measures a resource input variable, not student learning outcomes. Goals 4 and 5 measure progression for first-time, full-time students, thus ignoring or discounting the nature of the System’s students. However, Preliminary Recommendations 2(e), 3, 4, 5, and 6 address through an outcomes approach the issues that these goals otherwise highlight. (Tracking students through the System and across the Maine post-secondary education landscape, as noted in Recommendation 2(e) could prove valuable, if it captured transfer information.) Relative to Program Planning and Review, Goal 3 should address programs, and the Committee needs to engage the System Planning and Policy Analysis Office regarding how to establish and evaluate enrollment relative to programs before making a recommendation.

Goal 6. Provide student support by requesting additional funding for financial aid. The Committee has postponed discussion related to this goal until the Scanell and Kurz Consulting report on Financial Aid is available for review.

Goal 7. Develop and improve academic support services, which will enhance the ability of traditional and non-traditional student to achieve their academic potential. Preliminary Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6 address this goal.

Goal 8. Continue to provide access to non-traditional students by developing and sustaining academically enriched “two plus two” programs. See Preliminary Recommendation 5 and 6.

Goal 9. Work cooperatively with the Maine Community College System to address the need for Associate Degree Programs. See Preliminary Recommendations 5 and 6.
I. OVERVIEW

Meetings: The Committee met four times during the spring, on March 22, April 2, April 20, and May 17. In addition, members from each campus surveyed their constituents to gather ideas.

The committee is charged with exploring the following goals:
--refine compensation goals for faculty and staff in accordance with the UMS Compensation Philosophy to achieve competitive, equitable compensation and to attract, reward, and retain a highly qualified workforce.
This goal will be addressed by the committee during the next academic year.

--Strengthen criteria and implementation for faculty review.
This goal will be addressed by the committee during the next academic year.

--Find new ways to enable faculty interaction and exchange of ideas.
The committee had extensive discussions about this topic. See below.

--Set targets for endowed professorships as well as targets for endowed chairs.
This goal will be addressed by the committee during the next academic year.

--Provide faculty with availability of technology in the classroom.
This goal was among the items about which faculty opinion was gathered this spring. More discussion will follow during the next academic year.

--Set higher standards for programs and activities for faculty and staff development and invest in those programs.
The committee discussed this topic. See below.

--Provide appropriate staff to support faculty to enable them to increase their productivity.
This goal will be addressed by the committee during the next academic year.
--Develop a System-wide faculty development program, including mentoring, which is designed by the faculty with input from the System office. The committee discussed this topic. See below.

Outline of Committee discussions this spring:

While the committee's discussions were extensive and wide-ranging, the topics covered can be usefully organized as follows:

1. What is faculty staff development?
2. System activities/policies that could be refined to provide more/better development opportunities;
3. New things that the System could do;
4. Faculty-staff connection strategies;
5. System activities that could supplement campus programs;
6. Connections to other Strategic Plan initiatives;
7. Recommendations that could be implemented now.

1. What is faculty-staff development?
   --help faculty understand impact of teaching/learning and the scholarship of teaching and learning
   --knowledge of student development
   --career development /interventions at critical points
   --pay, benefits and incentives all have to work in concert
   --other TBD

2. System activities/policies that could be refined to provide more/better development opportunities.

Policies (the committee kept in mind that many of these topics would need to be collectively bargained as appropriate.)
- Salaries, made more comparable across job categories and institutions.
- something to reward regular use of finess center facilities; e.g., possible reciprocity of memberships for those travelling around the state.
- tuition benefit for employees -- occasionally grant LWOP and opportunity to take more than 2 courses/term.
- adjustments to maternity/paternity leave;
- child care opportunities
- tenure "clock" adjustments

Activities
- System-wide event calendar with provisions for timely notice of cancellations
3. New Things that the System could do

- take development activities to statewide conferences where faculty/staff already go;
- increase capacity of established centers at UM and USM, and make their offerings open, welcoming and accessible for all campuses;
- centralized support for international faculty and staff, immigration, J-1 visas, etc.
- "Management Institute" model for new chairs, supervisors, mid-career personnel;
- "circuit riders" who could give talks/seminars at several campuses. This could be UMS faculty/staff or outside experts;
- centralized grant support;
- system-wide recognition of accomplishments

4. Faculty-Staff Connection Strategies

- use of PolyCom and other System media for conferences, collaboration, information-sharing. Possibly a Webzine listing activities already occurring and how to register, abstracts re scholarship of learning, good upcoming conferences, links to good Web resources, books, etc. The Web could also be used for a directory to make faculty-staff connections across campuses;
- System support of academic conferences to encourage cross-campus collaboration
- rotate UMS support for various collaborative activities so that they don't get "stale" and support can be widely shared over time;
- support established faculty or staff groups to meet;
- bring together faculty from one discipline;
- inventory faculty/staff skills for short-term consulting, mentoring ... could be done electronically;
- target introductory courses for development activities; community college faculty may be usefully involved in this too

5. System activities that could supplement campus programs

There should be a basic program of faculty-staff development on each campus. These programs can be supplemented with certain System practices, e.g.:

-- When faculty apply for sabbaticals, fill in with courses from other campuses or via other modalities if department lacks replacement coverage;
-- Trustee professors -- showcase in System or make available to visit other campuses;
-- IT workshops -- make available via alternative media, expert visits to more than one campus, etc.;
-- Brown bag seminars -- invite all to attend via System calendar;
-- Trainings -- supplement local trainings with system-wide ones for new employees, those with new responsibilities, etc.
Here is a table to indicate how Campus and System activities might complement each other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. campus orientation</td>
<td>1. UMS/Maine tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local supports for teaching and research</td>
<td>2. Scholarship of teaching and learning, general presentation via electronic media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. mentoring</td>
<td>3. Opportunities at UM, USM that are open to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support spouse/partner professional needs</td>
<td>4. Mentoring introduction to professional colleagues across System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connecting on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-tenure faculty**

Pre-tenure faculty collaboration opportunities so faculty can be active professionally and can get "outside" evaluation letters; may be discipline-based or interdisciplinary

**Established Faculty**

Established Faculty

1. "backfill" courses from other campuses so faculty can have sabbaticals

2. Lifelong career development

3. New leader seminars (for dept chairs, office heads, etc.)
6. Connections to other Strategic Plan initiatives

Faculty and staff development issues connect with essentially all the other Strategic Plan initiatives. A prime task for next year will be making all the relevant connections and structuring the work to eliminate redundancies but yet create a plan that meets all the goals.

7. Recommendations that could be implemented now

At its May 17 meeting, the members present observed that there are several things that could be done now rather than waiting another year. These include:

--Set up a UMS website with searchable list of new and continuing faculty with name, campus, bio, picture and research interests. Faculty could register electronically. This would facilitate making research and teaching links across campuses.

--Have a bus tour of the state for all new faculty.

Finally, each Task Force will need to review the new NEASC guidelines for accreditation to make sure that each campus is helped to meet the new requirements by means of the projects and initiatives that result from the Strategic Plan implementation process.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 3:
First Report
June 5, 2005

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

I. OVERVIEW

The full implementation committee held four meetings—March 10, March 22, April 11, and May 2. These meetings were all in person to allow for full interaction. To accommodate those whose schedules did not allow participation in person, however, the meetings were made available over video conferencing. Some committee members attended all meetings in their entirety. To ensure the greatest participation, these meetings were also recorded and made available electronically.

The committee is composed of twenty-four members providing broad representation from every area of the University of Maine System, including faculty, students, adult education, distance education providers, administrators, and educational technology providers.

Given the various categories of the goals for this strategic direction, the committee arranged its work around four primary areas: (1) services for distance learners, (2) programs offered, (3) faculty resources and development, and (4) technology for delivering education.

The full committee was broken down into four subcommittees, each assigned one of the categories mentioned above. Each of these subcommittees met a number of times between full committee meetings and reported their deliberations to the full committee. The recommendations in this preliminary report have all been reviewed and approved by the full committee.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Administer the delivery of distance education by a centralized support unit, to assure consistent statewide service to student, campus, and faculty customers. In collaboration and deliberate planning with the campuses, this unit will coordinate program and course scheduling; coordinate statewide marketing; coordinate delivery of administrative and student support technology to centers and sites; coordinate library and bookstore services for distance/statewide courses; and
create and maintain an on-line portal for all UMS courses and degrees delivered statewide at a distance

2. Conduct a review and revitalization of the UMS link to adult education programs at sites. Develop a matrix to assess cost effectiveness of sites based on enrollments, expense to the UMS, the 15 to 20 mile rule, delivery technology, and local investment (intangibles). Develop and/or increase programs to meet the needs of local teachers and high school students.

3. Reconsider the recommendation to align University College Centers with regional campuses.

4. Encourage the Community College System to participate in the delivery of distance education programming by leveraging the resources of the two systems.

5. Continue the commitment of UMS universities to on-site classes at centers.

6. Consider flexible residency requirements, at universities offering distance degree programs that accommodate and enhance the course options and financial aid needs of distance learners.

7. Gather relevant information to make more informed decisions regarding future programming, including certificate programs, early college options, undergraduate degrees, bachelor completion degrees and graduate degrees. Include programming needs; barriers, incentives and best practices for encouraging faculty and departments to launch new programs; and best-practice tuition models that simultaneously encourage strong enrollments and sound fiscal management.

8. Design an internal RFP process that invites the UMS universities to offer entire programs, approved by the standard approval processes at the campus and system level, that students can access via computer. Programs may be phased in over time, with universities designing successive course clusters, sequences and/or modules that build to a degree. The RFP should provide system-financed incentives that reward the institutions above and beyond the minimum guidelines for individual course development as outlined in the AFUM contract. Special attention should be given to degree programs that articulate with existing programs from within the UMS and/or the Maine Community College System, and may include collaborative efforts with birth-12.

9. Explore the benefits of establishing a UMS Distance Learning Council with broad faculty and staff representation (both technology and programming) by all campuses, the purpose of which would be to provide a forum for discussion of distance education issues, policies and procedures, and would be advisory to the (e.g., Director of University college Outreach). Also consider including representation from K-12 and the Maine Community College System.
Distance Learning Council would also sponsor and coordinate the RFP process, and forward other concerns and suggestions to the CAOs Council as appropriate.

10. Address the anticipated evolution of the University College Outreach Centers and implications for programming. The process should encourage campuses to expand access to upper division and graduate level offerings at the centers using an appropriate mix of teaching and learning modalities that meet the needs of the students. These may include face-to-face, online, ITV and/or videoconferencing.

11. Study national models for extending University programming to high schools and adult education programs, with a view to attracting more Maine citizens to Maine’s public universities.

12. Enlist the services of accreditation consultants (e.g., Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications and/or NEASC) to determine our broad compliance with those standards dealing with faculty development and support services best practices for electronically offered courses and programs.

13. Provide broad and timely faculty training with respect to both pedagogy (e.g., redesigning learning resources, guiding students to external online resources, student support via online communication, etc.) and delivery technology (e.g., course management systems, discussion forums, uploading documents, videoconferencing, whiteboards, etc.). [Review preliminary data of SD #3 survey of campuses regarding faculty development services, status of campus technology infrastructure, and technical support services.]

14. Provide broad, uniform and consistent administrative support for teaching distance courses including both financial support (e.g., financial incentives for course development such as additional compensation, graduate assistantships, etc.) and assurance that distance teaching is considered in promotion and tenure considerations. [Review preliminary data of SD #3 survey of UMS campuses regarding workload issues, campus governance procedures for distance delivered courses, faculty compensation practices, and evaluation of electronically delivered courses.]

15. Provide peer support systems, mentoring programs, virtual communities of practice, and workshops throughout the UMS, in conjunction with the proposed UMS Distance Education Council.

16. Develop migration paths to new technologies with recognition that Instructional Television (ITV) may be needed for some time to come.

17. Investigate alternatives to Instructional Television (ITV) audio return. Expanded mechanisms to interact with students could be used with a variety of technologies.
18. Explore use of Department of Education networks and interfaces with DOE classroom technologies.

19. Pursue possibilities of continuing use of the educational frequency spectrum that is licensed to the UMS, by partnering with commercial wireless network providers. Such ventures could allow for an electronic pathway for delivery of whatever technologies are used.

20. Review the needed hours, scope, and technologies available for technical support to students.

21. Refresh and modernize existing distance education origination classrooms to provide updated technologies consistent with delivery needs of the programs and audience.

III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP

This committee’s work intersects most significantly with that of the following Strategic Directions. Close ongoing collaboration among the implementation chairs, possibly combined with the use of short-term, cross-committee work groups, will be necessary to address some of these areas of intersection. Committees should also be encouraged to share updated recommendation lists as work progresses over the next year.

SD #1 — Academic program planning and quality. How are degree programs available at a distance best developed, and what is the best way to assess and monitor their quality? Do student support services for students taking distance courses/program differ from those needed by students in traditional courses/programs, and how are they best provided? What about such things as student/faculty ratios, retention strategies, and residency requirements for distance programs?

SD #2 — Faculty and staff development. How should distance course instructors be reviewed and compensated? How can the UMS encourage training, interaction, and exchange of ideas among distance instructors?

SD #4 — Libraries. How can the UMS facilitate the maximum possible use of digital library materials for distance students?

SD #5 — Research. How can the UMS facilitate undergraduate research opportunities for distance students? How is research best integrated into degree programs delivered at a distance?

SD #6 — Accountability. Institutional research capacity should adequately address distance programs/courses, to facilitate assessment of distance education’s
strengths and weaknesses on both the campus and UMS levels. Clear goals and objectives for financial management of distance education must be developed, on both the campus and UMS levels. A fair and equitable system of financing distance education must be developed that will encourage the growth and development of distance degree programs.

SD #7 — Centralization. The development of more integrated technology systems could have an impact on the structure of distance education in the UMS. Likewise, the degree to which various services are centralized could determine, to some extent, the degree to which distance education itself can/should be centralized.

SD #8 — Outreach sites and centers. The work of SD #3 overlaps in multiple obvious ways with the work of SD #8b, since the sites and centers serve as the “home campus” for many students who participate heavily in distance education. Common issues include cost, access, and quality. SD #3 also overlaps with the UMM/UMFK/UMPI consortium, since it is likely that those campuses will begin to employ distance education more heavily in shared courses and the development of shared degree programs, both undergraduate and graduate.

SD #9 — Advancement and advocacy. The UMS must strongly advocate for, and market, the benefits of distance education to the residents of the State of Maine.

IV. GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

The committee will consider all feedback and responses to this report before moving forward with further implementation planning. Having identified areas to be considered, our next steps will be to address and refine each of our recommendations, articulate outcomes, identify actions steps, and determine costs and possible sources of funding where appropriate. We will continue to meet at Orono every three to four weeks, and broadcast our meetings to those members unable to attend on-site. Close collaboration with the SD #1 and SD #8b committees will be especially necessary, as well as exploring relationships with the Maine Community College System, Maine State Department of Education, and other educational entities in the state.
I. OVERVIEW

Process:
At a introductory planning meeting with about 18 members of the Strategic Direction #4 group present, four subgroups were formed based on the four goals published in the Implementation Planning Process (January 2005). The goals and the subgroup’s focuses are:
1) Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state;
2) Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium founded on one strong, well funded research library at the University of Maine;
3) Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the Statewide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine; and
4) Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library.

SD #4 subgroups met individually throughout the spring semester of 2005 by phone, in-person, and using video conferencing technology. Subgroup conveners met twice with the co-chairs to verify direction and progress. An end of semester meeting of all SD #4 members was held in late April to hear draft reports and collect feedback.

Each SD #4 subgroup was convened by UMS library professionals. They were charged with preparing draft subgroup reports reflecting their work through the end of April, and including recommendations that move the agenda forward and serve as discussion starters. To support the work of the subgroups, strategic planning documents prepared by the UMS library directors over the last five years where distributed and discussed, allowing the subgroups to become knowledgeable about the work done to date. It is understood by all that the summer and fall 2005 will be used to finalize draft one, collect feedback on these recommendations, and prepare objectives and strategies to actually effect implementation.

During the spring semester 2005, the UMS Library directors meeting with their colleagues from the State, Bangor Public and the Law and Legislative Reference Library (The URSUS Digital Library Group) continued to address the issues raised within the SD #4 goals.
Background and Themes:

The UMS libraries have an extensive history of collaboration, most evident from our current shared online catalog URSUS, which includes all ten libraries of the University of Maine System, the Maine State Library, the State Law and Legislative Library and the Bangor Public Library, and which connects to other Maine libraries' catalogs including Bates, Bowdoin, and Colby Colleges via the Maine Info Net. The libraries of the University of Maine System and the Maine State Library partner on the selection and provision of statewide indexes and databases, ensuring that libraries and citizens in smaller, rural areas of Maine are receiving the same basic resources as are larger libraries. This virtual digital library is a centralized service that the State and UMS Libraries offer, and Maine has been recognized nationally for its universal access using digital means. We will continue this collaboration on development and focus on efficiencies gained through coordination of routine back-office services. Collections will be managed through initiatives such as a Last Copy Center (Managed storage for last copies of critical materials – See below) and coordinated collection development between the individual libraries.

The UMS libraries are both virtual and physical spaces, as well as social centers for our campus and public communities. Our primary role on campus is to educate users, and to collaborate with faculty to promote information literacy, critical thinking, and evaluating these outcomes through assessment. Each library is a unique expression and product of the cultural heritage and characteristics of the place in which it is located, which is evident in the Digital Library. In addition, each campus is involved in research that is directly tie to economic development and the creative economy of its region (such as, arts in central and southern Maine, the wood composites lab and lobster research in Downeast Maine), offering an opportunity for even more collaboration across the state.

Concerns (Current Challenges 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

I. 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)

## II. Recommendations, Progress Made to Date, Outcomes and Assessment Measures:

The following draft vision statement provides the starting point for this report and lays the foundation for comprehensive recommendations.

**Goal 1 - Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state**

**Recommended Draft Vision Statement:** The UMS Libraries are a consortium of campus libraries that work collaboratively and cooperatively to provide systematic and efficient library resources and services to each member campus. Digital technology provides the means to offer universal access to all users, both on and off campus, and to unite new combinations of resources, services, and delivery systems. The Libraries offer both virtual and physical spaces for their services, and are a center of learning on their individual campuses and in their public communities. By partnering with faculty in the learning process, the UMS Libraries actively promote and teach information literacy. The Libraries are engaged in continual assessment of their effectiveness and outcomes.

**Goal 2 - Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium founded on one strong, well funded research library at the University of Maine**

The seven campus libraries will develop the historic collaboration among the UMS libraries into a more structured and formal consortium with commitments to partnerships in such areas collection development, technology, information literacy, staff development and efficient operations. Additionally, Fogler Library as the research library must be able to meet the needs of the System and the state as directed in Strategic Direction #4. Fogler Library has provided leadership during the past two decades for both the System and the State in the areas of collections building to support System-wide research, material delivery and the establishment of the digital library including URSUS and database resources.
Think of Fogler Library as the “hub of the wheel” of research for the University System. For this leadership to continue Fogler Library needs an increase in its base budget for both personnel and materials so that it can create needed digitally-based research sources and purchase available materials that will address research needs. This focus on a well-funded research library at UM in no way removes the possibility for other campus libraries to specialize in their own local collections to support the research specialties of the individual campuses, such as the Acadian Archives at UMFK, the Osher Map Library and the Muskie School of Public Service resource collection at USM. The campus libraries also need to be mission driven, as well. For instance, UMF might be designated the UMS education library, but the campus is also identified as the public liberal arts college of Maine, and as a result will need to develop a well-rounded collection for that mission.

Solutions for current space problems also need to be addressed. Fogler’s responsibility as the “single UMS doctoral/research library” requires that it maintain older materials and documents beyond typical academic library timeframes. To allow this to happen at UM, additional space will be needed. One of the potential means of answering the space problem for UMS libraries is to move forward with the proposal to significantly expand library storage at Orono for valuable but low use items needed for research. Fogler Library currently manages a climate controlled storage building on the UM campus which is full, but could be expanded for others to use as the University of Maine “Last Copy Center.” A last copy center is a central facility managed by librarians that would allow all Maine libraries to store only one copy of lesser used, older but valuable materials for all in the state to access when needed. Such a facility would permit all libraries to discard their copy(s) of the item going to the LCC, thereby saving space in local libraries. The storage facility could also be expanded at some point to include “large digitized data storage,” again, providing online access to digitized material storage from one location.

**Recommendations:**

Recommendations for this goal will fall within six areas:

1. Staffing to accomplish projects and ongoing work

2. Budget, including share of campus research funds, external grants and internal and external bonding opportunities. Fogler Library’s budget has to be indexed against inflation and it needs a funding formula that allows it to grow as the university grows. For example 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) and, in some cases, years of under funding. 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.

   a) The plan should call for an increase of $1 million each year in base funding for the library’s acquisitions budget to compensate for past and current materials inflation. In other words, over five years there would be a $5 million increase. After that the materials budget could just be indexed for annual inflation.
b) 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.

c) 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.

3. Collection development and technical services (acquisitions and cataloging) functions of the library 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. A master collection of “last copies”, derived from the campus library collections, will be housed in the Last Copy Center.

4. Focus and fund Fogler Library’s role as the System leader in development and expansion of the UMS digital library including purchased databases, created databases, specialized staff, hardware and software.

5. Add space to the Library for multiple purposes. The Raymond H. Fogler Library is functionally obsolete and at capacity. Fogler no longer meets the educational needs of the University System and the State as a research library. With over 1 million volumes, limited individual study space and no group study space, the library does not appropriately support the educational and research requirements of the University of Maine, the University of Maine System, the designation as the State’s Research and Development library, and other community library and State demands.

a) Construction of a 96,000 square foot addition is necessary to accommodate collections and provide appropriate study space

b) Fogler Library is in serious need of repair and renovation to make it safe, accessible, digitally capable, and user friendly. The original 1944 building needs to be redesigned and the center core stacks removed to address safety and accessibility issues. All the collection shelving in the library is in violation of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for access.

c) To ensure the most cost effective storage solution for collection growth, installation of compact shelving and a mezzanine in the Library Annex building is required. This will provide long-term growth space for collections. The annex building would serve as a digitizing and Last Copy Center for all University of Maine System and other Maine libraries.
6. Continue the System commitment to the very successful statewide delivery service used to deliver print items

FUNDING NEEDS FOR FOGLER LIBRARY’S FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS AND BASE BUDGET: Costs not specified at this time – will be included in draft two

- Increase in staffing
- $1 million increase in base funding for each of five years for acquisitions
- Index UM Library budget for inflation
- Provide a share of the U/M facilities bond money to the library
- Provide 4% of indirect cost recovery to the library from all UM grants and contracts
- Expand and upgrade annex to become UMS Last Copy Center
- Build 96,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs

Goal 3 - Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the statewide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine

Recommendation: Over a period of the next three to five years, implement the major directions proposed by the NELINET Consulting Solutions in their July 2003 Report to UMS.

The consultants provide recommendations that “would identify the branding and terminology to support the quickest and most complete statewide understanding of the services so it is possible to market the benefits of Maine Info Net to the state legislature, the general public and the participating libraries.” Maine Info Net is viewed as a multi-type collaborative effort for the citizens of Maine.

Upon implementation of these recommendations, Maine Info Net will become the primary gateway or portal to library and related information for all citizens in Maine, in much the same way OhioLink, and Illinet have for these states. The University of Maine System, Colby, Bates and Bowdoin local library systems will continue to serve and be recognized by their local users as their own library system, but it will also become clear that Maine Info Net is the umbrella or overarching library structure for the state of Maine.

Since its inception, the University of Maine System URSUS (digital) library budget has contributed to electronic resources offered through Maine Info Net where better prices and negotiating leverage are available. State, PUC e-rate, and University dollars together provide the foundation resources for all Maine library users.

NELINET Consulting Solutions states the following set of recommendations, and they are endorsed by the SD #4 Task Force:

1) Creation of a new Info Net Board with members representing all participants
2) The Board will be a membership organization while assuring substantial accountability to and participation of the membership – a “consortium of consortia”

3) The Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System will be formal partners and the sponsors of Maine Info Net

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

5) Maine Info Net requires sustainable funding and reasonable dues ultimately becoming self-sustaining

6) Maine Info Net will have a CEO and dedicated staff
   a. CEO will report jointly to the UMS and the Maine Library Commission
   b. CEO position will be funded by the UMS and the Maine Library Commission

7) Maine Info Net should establish and enforce standards and policies for member participation in the union catalog

8) Maine Info Net should have a clear identity and brand name

9) Marketing and public relations must be developed that focus on its three key constituent groups: libraries, library users and funding sources

10) Info Net should aim to become the Maine library portal to the world of information

11) Info Net should raise the level of library practice with the state by providing new tools and promoting best practices

12) Use InfoNet to assist the Librarians with reinventing themselves to further respond to the state’s citizens’ future library and information needs especially with new information seeking behaviors

Note: The biggest shift moving to Maine Info Net as the library gateway for the State is the University System adapting to the role 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 and UMS’s Board accept and formalize a legal working agreement that heretofore the University has managed informally, i.e., that UMS Libraries as one of the major sponsors of Maine Info Net will fully represent the interests of not only the UMS but also of all other members of the higher education community in the state, whether those institutions are public or private.

The Maine Info Net staff, 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 and supervises the Maine Info Net CEO and provides policy direction to him or her and the Board.

**Goal 4 – Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital**

The future success of the University of Maine System Libraries depends on continued growth and development of the statewide digital library. Since the inception of our
online URSUS catalog in 1988, much progress has been made. One 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 have for years been the backbone of this initiative. For the UMS to continue to make online and other technologically based resources available to all our students, faculty and staff, as well as Maine citizens, an investment in the continued development of the digital library is critical.

Recommendations:
Inserted below for consideration and discussion are proposed funding formula options (spreadsheets) intended to stabilize the current UMS URSUS (digital) library operation, and to be responsive to continuing and growing digital library needs of the citizens of Maine. Formulas are based on models obtained from Florida and Texas.

Spreadsheet Notes:
- Used FY 05 as the data and credit hours as the basis for assessments
- Basic Budget: Budget approved for FY'05 as presented by Abbott to CFOs - "Base" label indicates presumed System funding
- "Index" will be assessed to campuses
- Credit hours and assessments based on FY '04 credit hours and the assessments per hour for various degree levels

BUDGET SCOPE AND LIMITATION:
The funding formula described below provides is designed to address current operations and maintenance of the University of Maine System URSUS library operations and resources with a choice of two inflation indexes. It does not provide for capital equipment acquisition or replacement, nor does it include necessary funding for Fogler Library’s facility improvements and base budget needs.

The formula does include a modest increase of $50,000 annually to support startup and testing of digital initiatives – 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.

Finally, the budget formula below does not address the costs associated with upgrading Fogler Library’ budget and facility to the level of a moderate to strong
research library center. Those costs are outlined above under Goal two and will be
detailed in draft two.

UMS Strategic Direction #4 Task Force Report: DRAFT ONE

PROPOSED URSUS/DIGITAL LIBRARY FUNDING FORMULAS FOR DISCUSSION

With $50K digital initiative assuming 50% to base and 50% to campus assessments

Formulas 1 & 2 apply ARL and HEPI inflation indexes respectively
ARL= Association of Research Libraries' inflation factor (10%)
HEPI =Higher education price index (3.5%)

NOTE: The SD #4 task force is also recommending a New Program
Factor that is added to the campus assessment every time
a new program is approved -- acknowledging that new programs do cost new money

Formula 1
Base budget + index + ARL x (index) + new program factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$290,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$315,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL factor</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Program Factor</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total $566,740

Formula 2
Base budget + HEPI x code 542 +


index + ARL x index + new program factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Initiative</td>
<td>System assessment</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$319,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Grand Total              | $568,721 |

Credit Hours by Campus, by Level, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20,773</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>111,786</td>
<td>76,501</td>
<td>16,863</td>
<td>30,627</td>
<td>17,249</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>11,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127,766</td>
<td>101,635</td>
<td>42,083</td>
<td>31,298</td>
<td>19,402</td>
<td>13,603</td>
<td>9,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment with 27%/20% credit hour exemption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>$15,164.29</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$495.67</td>
<td>$1,277.50</td>
<td>$586.92</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$81,604</td>
<td>$55,846</td>
<td>$12,310</td>
<td>$22,357</td>
<td>$12,592</td>
<td>$8,097</td>
<td>$5,157</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>$8,175</td>
<td>$9,571</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>$1,886</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,167</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>$2,142</td>
<td>$4,754</td>
<td>$2,435</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$807</td>
<td>$417</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$93,807</td>
<td>$74,604</td>
<td>$29,909</td>
<td>$22,725</td>
<td>$13,894</td>
<td>$9,791</td>
<td>$6,908</td>
<td>$251,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus New Program Assessment based on projected library needs for each new program added

### III. Key Areas of Overlap:
a. SD #1 – A strong well funded UMS research library and the statewide digital library, fully integrated with the teaching, learning and research processes will assure quality and support rigorous academic programs.
b. SD #2 – Faculty development is dependent on access to a strong research library
c. SD #3 – Access to online technologically based library resources and related library services are essential to students’ distance learning success
d. SD #5 – Expanded UMS research in all of its aspects is dependent on a strong well funded research library at the University of Maine
e. SD #6 – Niche development and accountability at each campus will help focus the needs of the campus and in turn the needs of the library
f. SD #9 – Working with fund raising leadership will help obtain support for expanding digital library initiative, building expansion and collection development

IV. Goals for Next Steps

- Summer 2005: update and revised recommendations and finalize draft one
- Fall 2005: distribute draft one to campus and community constituencies and prepare draft two with objectives for implementation by December
- Spring 2006: Collect further feedback, finalize draft three including planning with State of Maine on Maine Info Net and prepare final report with objectives and assessment measures
Strategic Direction 5 - 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.

I. Process Used to Date:

The Committee had two in-person meetings (03/02 and 05/12) and three PolyCom meetings (03/17, 03/31, and 04/28). The seven goals identified in the implementation plan were discussed and self-selected subgroups formulated recommendations for each goal.

II. Goals and Recommendations:

1. Request Additional R&D Funds from the State to Support Sponsored Research

In 1997, the Maine Legislature established the Maine Economic Improvement Fund (MEIF) to help increase federal and private investment in university-based research. This investment was undertaken because of the documented cause-and-effect relationship between university research activity and the creation of new products, new technologies, new industries, and new jobs. MEIF focuses on seven key areas:

Aquaculture and Marine Sciences
Biotechnology
Composites and Advanced Materials Technologies
Environmental Technologies
Information Technologies
Advanced Technologies for Forestry and Agriculture
Precision Manufacturing

Under Maine law, the State appropriates MEIF funds directly to the University of Maine System (UMS), which in turn allocates the funds to the University of Maine (UMaine) and the University of Southern Maine (USM), the two universities with specific institutional responsibility for basic and applied research in the seven research areas.

At both universities, MEIF funds are used for similar purposes: 1) to provide the required matching funds necessary to leverage grants and contracts; 2) to purchase research equipment and acquire or upgrade the physical space in which research will be
conducted; and 3) for targeted support of researchers, support staff, and students. However, the use of those funds differs according to the role, history, and current needs of the two universities.

For UMaine, MEIF funding is intended to help extend and expand the university’s well-established, historic role as the State’s primary and most diverse research institution. With UMaine’s formal responsibility as a research institution, it already has a significant amount of infrastructure in place and therefore can use large portions of its MEIF funds to target specific research and grant opportunities.

For USM, MEIF funding is used to build and develop the necessary infrastructure to compete for research funding in fields of scientific and economic relevance to the institution and its region. For USM, MEIF funding is essential to develop the infrastructure necessary to expand the university’s research capacity and promise. Once that infrastructure is in place, USM will be better positioned to attract external research grants and contracts.

During the fiscal year ending 30 June 2004, UMaine and USM used MEIF funds to leverage $42.8 million in external grants and contracts, primarily from the federal government. Those funds support hundreds of jobs, purchase millions of dollars in goods and services, and lead to the creation of new technologies and industries that will fuel Maine’s economy. The return on investment was 4 to 1 and 857 full-time equivalent positions were created and/or supported as a result of MEIF funds and external grants and contracts.

Further analysis of the data indicate that, in FY04, UMaine leveraged 80% of the total MEIF funds available for a 5 to 1 return on investment, and USM leveraged their 20% of MEIF funds for a return of 1 to 1. Clearly, a well-established infrastructure (UMaine) and history of obtaining grants is advantageous for attracting federal and private funds. The importance of history and a well-established infrastructure is also demonstrated by USM’s Muskie School of Public Service, which was awarded $42 million in FY04. Expanding infrastructure and developing a history of success in the State’s target areas is helping USM to better leverage the MEIF investments.

The UMS and the State of Maine do not currently have the resources to invest in research infrastructure that would enable all seven campuses to be competitive for federal and private funding. Issues of critical mass and research infrastructure are limiting to the smaller campuses. And yet, faculty on all seven campuses of the UMS are required to engage in research, scholarly activity, or creative expression. This implementation group should continue the discussion of this complex issue.
Recommendations:

MEIF funding for UMaine and USM should be increased by $28M to a total of $40M by FY 2009 because of their demonstrated ability to leverage federal and private funds, resulting in increased jobs and economy expansion.

An additional amount of MEIF funds should be set aside for a pilot program involving one of the other campuses partnering with either UMaine or USM. Campuses other than UMaine or USM should be the lead, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of this strategy needs to be conducted.

A State-investment fund for non-MEIF areas needs to be established. There are acknowledged opportunities for investment that would benefit the State, e.g., prevention of childhood disorders (obesity) and chronic diseases (cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetes); health services research; tourism; and the creative economy. This recommendation can result in System-wide collaborations.

Funds collected by UMS from the indirect costs recovered by UMaine and USM will be used to match the professional development budgets for scholarship of the other five campuses.

2. **Strengthen Sponsored Research by Coordinating the Process of Requesting Increased Funding**

Advocacy, planning, and development are much more effective when all campuses are using the same process and coordinating their requests.

Recommendations:

The campuses of Fort Kent, Machias, and Presque Isle need to have a significantly strengthened grant-seeking capability and management capability so that all could build research resources to encourage scholarly activity. In addition, UMaine’s Office of Research and Sponsored Programs should be available for consultation and training seminars with these three campuses. USM’s Office of Research and Sponsored Programs should be available for consultation and training seminars and R&D operating funds from individual campuses needs to be established.

A calendar for annual R&D bond requests and R&D operating funds from individual campuses needs to be established. Requests should be communicated through the President of each campus to the System. System decisions need to be communicated back to individual campuses in a clear and timely fashion. There needs to be established a process for insuring coordination of constituencies, campus representatives, and System representatives.
3. Increase Graduate Fellowships across the System

Recent reports on Graduate Education by the University of Maine and the University of Southern Maine speak to the current inadequacy of graduate assistantships and fellowships. At neither institution are the institutionally funded assistantships competitive with the respective national peer institutions. This presents significant problems in the recruitment of students and the ability to compete nationally and internationally for the best available graduate students.

Recommendations:

Graduate assistantship stipends should, at a minimum, be set at the median level of assistantships at peer institutions. Different minima should be set for Masters and Doctoral students. Health insurance should be provided for all full time graduate students.

Institutionally funded research assistantships (such as the Provost and UGRA fellowships at UMaine and Graduate funded research assistants at USM) need to be of sufficient number and set at a higher level to attract and retain top graduate students.

In collaboration with their respective Development offices, campuses need to develop and implement a fundraising campaign to generate endowed or named graduate fellowships. These fellowship programs should be designed to recruit the most promising graduate students to the universities and to support them in reaching their highest potential.

Increased research on campuses will help secure more external funding of graduate assistantships. Universities also need to identify sources of support for students in the growing number of professional masters programs whose support needs differ from students in research programs.

4. Enhance the Graduate Education Experience and Build the System’s Research and Scholarly Capacity

The graduate education experience in any university is multi-faceted. It is related to the learning, research and mentoring experience; the supporting research infrastructure such as libraries and computing facilities; adequate financial support; a strong and vital graduate community; the recognition and promotion of graduate education on campus; and the promotion and marketing off campus.
Recommendations:

Graduate education, particularly at the doctoral level, can be an expensive enterprise, requiring dedicated faculty time, space, equipment and fiscal resources. Each campus engaged in, or desirous of becoming engaged in graduate education, should develop a strategic plan which outlines the size of the student population to be served as well as the demand for, and the direction of, programs being developed. It should outline the capacity to support graduate education, most importantly the ability of its graduate faculty to deliver the programs and the potential funding to support graduate programs.

Campuses which are unable to commit the necessary resources to offer quality graduate education should explore the option of delivering graduate education through distance education in collaboration with UM and USM. This could be a particularly attractive option for place bound students who wish to pursue professional and non-thesis masters degree programs.

A University’s ability to sustain excellent graduate research and education depends on its ability to hire and retain the best faculty. Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines should place an appropriate emphasis on graduate research, scholarship and education consistent with the University’s Carnegie status. Where departments do not have strong graduate programs of their own or NEASC accreditation standards, the guidelines should address participation in interdisciplinary graduate study. Departments should have clearly written criteria for appointment and reappointment to graduate faculty, and these criteria should seek to promote and maintain the quality of the department’s graduate program. Each University should implement an appropriate policy that recognizes and rewards strong faculty performance and participation in graduate research, scholarship and education.

The success of graduate students depends, in part, on the strength of graduate programs. Campuses should periodically evaluate the quality of their graduate programs through internal or external review. Marginal programs should be given the opportunity to improve, and failing improvement they should be terminated.

High quality graduate research and education can only be achieved if the campuses have high quality infrastructure and resources. Key elements of this include libraries, particularly Fogler Library, which is the State’s only research library, and which must be a world-class repository of knowledge. In addition to physical holdings, access to comprehensive on-line full-text literature must continue to be an extremely high priority.

Acquisition and upgrading of analytical instrumentation and cyber infrastructure must keep pace with national developments if our graduate students are to develop the skills and expertise to make them competitive in the new, high-technology job market.

5. Set Greater Incentives for Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Expression including Appropriately Adjusting Teaching Loads
Faculty on all seven campuses of the UMS are required to engage in research, scholarly activity, or creative expression. The most effective way to reward productivity in research is to provide meaningful incentives.

**Recommendations:**

Reward faculty members that contribute to excellence in research with salary raises and endowed professorships.

Create a baseline of indirect costs recovered above which all indirect costs is returned, using the following formula: return 30% of indirect costs to faculty who generate it, 30% to the Departments/Centers, and retain the remaining 40% for maintenance and facilities

Reduce teaching loads to free up time for research

1. Develop University-wide policy to formally acknowledge advising of students conducting research at all levels (BS, MS and PhD) as part of workload

2. Re-appoint non-research active faculty to carry extra teaching burden at the campuses where the normal teaching loads are lower than 12 credit hours per semester

3. Innovative scheduling to free-up time: block classes, longer intensive classes

4. Course release time to faculty for writing grant applications; Offer SRAs - Special Research Assignments - like they do in other institutions, where faculty members can apply for release from one course to conduct research instead.

5. Create more flexible workload assignments

6. More time-effective teaching schedules -- for example:
   a. 1 1/2 hour classes on Mondays and Wednesdays or Wednesdays and Fridays
   b. more "doubling up" on sections of the same course to reduce prep time, where this does not conflict with the individual campus missions
   c. Team teaching
   d. Four-week classes
7. Decrease teaching loads for active research faculty

Better integrate research goals with undergraduate education by, for example, giving teaching credit to those who work with work merit students, encouraging student-faculty research relationships by urging students to take independent studies with faculty (and giving faculty teaching credit for these), and encouraging faculty to teach seminar-type courses centered around their own research projects. All of these could result in undergraduate research (REU) applications to the NSF.

Increase pool of work-study students, and provide more summer work-study or work-merit, so that undergraduate research help is available on all campuses.

Create system-wide graduate assistantships that would enable qualified graduate students to teach courses on other campuses. The recipient campus would have to provide housing for the student and a meal plan for the days that the graduate student is away from his/her home campus. This would alleviate the burden of finding adjuncts to replace courses of faculty who have been given research reassignments.

Reward grant success of tenured faculty by linking Post-Tenure Review salary increments (administration option) strongly to external funding.

Create a set of incentives for non-faculty with advanced degrees to engage in research (e.g., paid/unpaid leave, retirement).

Create an annual or biennial System-wide research demonstration and PI recognition event, similar to ones held on individual campuses, that showcases and rewards outstanding undergraduate, graduate, and faculty research and that provides opportunities not only for positive community relations but also for potential future collaborations among attendees.

6. Support Faculty in Generating Grants

Increase Library and IT Support

1. Provide library resources researchers need, including databases such as the Science Citation Index Online, Science Direct, and library collections for all campuses.

2. Provide increased high-speed Ethernet access within a reasonable time frame for all campuses.

Streamline Administrative Procedures to Improve Efficiency

1. Create a culture of administrative efficiency on all campuses.
a. Hire a consultant to review, simplify, and streamline research administrative procedures

b. Simplify and speed-up hiring, purchasing, and merit-raise procedures for research personnel on funded grants and contracts

c. Make access to post-award budgets web-based and more comprehensible

d. Create a local FastLane-like system for grant preparation and administration, including an electronic "green sheet", automatic generation of current and pending commitments for faculty, etc.

e. Streamline the bureaucracy of record-keeping as much as possible

2. Provide formalized administrative procedures training for appropriate personnel at all campuses

   a. As part of the training, provide a booklet of all research administrative procedures in one place: PAFs, hiring, raises, purchasing, etc …, also available in searchable form on line

   b. Provide real salary incentives for outstanding administrative staff

7. Expand Opportunities for Undergraduate Research

Undergraduate Students and Outreach: Integrate R&D Culture into the Undergraduate Curriculum

1. Involving undergraduates in scholarly activity should be considered a "best practice" by UMS.

2. Better integrate scholarly activity goals with undergraduate education by, for example, giving teaching credit to those who work with work merit students, link increased participation with undergraduates in scholarly activity to decreased expectations for campus and/or system service work for faculty. Encourage student-faculty research relationships by urging students to take independent studies with faculty (and giving faculty teaching credit for these), and encouraging faculty to teach seminar-type courses centered around their own scholarly activity projects.
3. Link increased participation with undergraduates in scholarly activity to decreased expectations for campus and/or system service work for faculty.

4. Provide time for faculty to write Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU) proposals to NSF, and when said proposals are funded, provide time and administrative assistance to implement those programs.

5. Provide support to cover the costs of undergraduate research supplies and encourage access to specialized research equipment located on the larger campuses by faculty and students from the smaller campuses.

6. Develop a system-wide mechanism for purchasing general-use equipment, statewide software licenses, service contracts, etc. to be used by undergraduates in their scholarly activities.

7. Showcase undergraduate research and creative work as an advocacy tool with the governor, legislature, media, etc. Undergraduate scholarly activity from every campus could be regularly featured in state-wide media outlets such as the Bangor Daily News and the Portland Press Herald along with local television outlets.

III. Key Areas of Overlap

Strategic Direction #4 – Enhancing Library Resources. The importance of adequate library resources, and their accessibility, cannot be emphasize enough. It is especially important at the smaller campuses, where fewer resources mean more limited physical holdings, and a trip to the libraries at Southern Maine or Orono often means the loss of a full day of work. Lack of comprehensive on-line full text access to the literature slows down the work of all researchers at all campuses.

Strategic Direction #2 – Faculty/Staff Development. Many of the recommendations for strengthening and leveraging research throughout the state include opportunities for professional development of faculty and staff at all campuses.

IV. Concerns

Those campuses who do not currently qualify for access to MEIF funds on their own have asked the System to define the criteria that must be satisfied before they would qualify for consideration.
V. **Next Steps**

Summer 2005: Collect data from faculty members on specific details on how to best implement these recommendations. We have developed a survey to test on one of the campuses and will use the results to modify the survey for collecting information to update and revise recommendations and finalize draft one.

Fall 2005: distribute draft one to campus and community constituencies and prepare draft two with objectives for implementation by December 2005.

Spring 2006: collect further feedback and finalize the final report with objectives and assessment measures.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 6:
First Report
June 5, 2005

Strategic Direction 6 – Require accountability from all universities by providing appropriate goals and objectives and carefully assessing each institution’s ability to meet its goals. Establish goals, objectives, and performance measures for each institution to ensure prudent stewardship and enhanced public accountability.

I. OVERVIEW

The UMS Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 20, 2004 contains nine strategic directions. The sixth strategic direction deals with accountability as stated above. Nationally, many University Systems are implementing accountability standards and feel that they are necessary to achieve student success, quality research and service, and greater productivity in higher education. The University of Maine System, through its Strategic Plan, embraces this philosophy and course of action.

The Maine State Government currently collects four productivity measures for UMS annually:
- Student enrollment
- Financial aid awards
- Gifts and donations received
- R&D expenditures

While these measures are collected, there is very little discussion about them by State policy leaders and there are no financial decisions made based upon them. More importantly, many have often questioned if these four measures accurately reflect UMS’s contributions to the Maine economy and the citizens of Maine.

Before UMS and its universities can be held accountable, one must first address what its being accountable for. Until this is fully discussed and determined, any policy recommendation may risk generating unintended consequences and creating an unleveled playing field for the University System and its individual universities.

II. PROGRESS MADE TO DATE

The UMS Strategic Plan Implementation Planning Process, adopted by the Board of Trustees, established a working committee on the issue of accountability. The committee is comprised of faculty, administrators and a student from the University System (see
appendix A). The committee held its first meeting on March 22, 2005 to examine the overall issue, review the external and internal financial environments, and established a work plan (see appendix B). This work resulted in a one-day retreat held on May 2, 2005 and was facilitated by Paul Lingenfelter, Executive Director, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO).

The committee unanimously agreed that before any serious work can be conducted concerning individual universities, the University System must address its importance and relationship with the needs of Maine citizens. This discussion was launched at the retreat and involved two main areas of discussion: accountability measures and internal funding methods. Below captures the essence of this discussion as facilitated by Paul Lingenfelter.

**ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES**

UMS must lead the discussion on State economic, social, and cultural needs and how the University System can serve the State by “closing the gaps.” UMS must assist the State’s public agenda. In doing so, UMS must work cooperatively with State leaders to address principles, accountability components, and responsibilities. These items should comprise the following points:

**Fundamental Principles:**
- Shared responsibility among all constituents for accountability and performance.
- Effective accountability is not based on fear or minimum standards.

**Components of Effective Accountability:**
- Affirm and pursue fundamental goals
- Focus on priorities
- Measure results

**Institutional Responsibilities:**
- Improve teaching and learning
- Assure access and affordability
- Assure quality and value
- Improve productivity

Following a general discussion of the principles, accountability components and responsibilities, it was suggested that the institutional responsibilities may be too self-serving and even detrimental to UMS. The committee then attempted to craft new and more relevant points that support the public agenda in Maine. Below are possible broad statements capturing the importance and responsibility of higher education in Maine:

---

• Educational excellence
• Conduct research, scholarship, and public outreach consistent with an institution’s mission
• Economic growth – jobs and careers
• Quality of life – maintaining and strengthening; cultural diversity
• Prepare students for secondary education
• Efficient uses of public resources
• Innovation and entrepreneurship; creativity and leadership development
• Industrial diversity – potential; natural resources; tourism
• Skilled labor supply and demand
• Change agent and shaping Maine’s future
• Aging population
• 21st century workforce
• Educational and civic engagement
• Preparing the next generation of leaders
• Seeking national recognition
• Attract new citizens to Maine with value

The overall conversation was then continued and enriched by focusing on internal funding methods.

**INTERNAL FUNDING METHODS**

*The question that matters most is not how a state does its budgeting, but whether or not it is achieving its goals. When analyzing budgetary issues, one must contemplate: goals, values, strategies, and tactics – and consider what’s best for Maine’s citizens. The committee discussed these issues at great length as summarized below.*

**Guiding Principles**
- Maintain flexibility
- Encourage creativity
- Be fair
- Be open
- Build trust

**Goals**
These are common goals for higher education:
- Make sure the state has a well-educated workforce
- Expand knowledge

---

2 Drawn from *Accountability in Higher Education* PowerPoint presentation by Paul Lingenfelter, SHEEO, May 2, 2005.
• Prepare the next generation for responsible citizenship
• Improve economic vitality and cultural life in communities
• Help the next generation improve its prosperity and life opportunities

It was felt that the five goals listed above may not express the goals most important to Maine, but the most important thing about goals is not the words, it’s building a consensus around them.

The State of Maine and UMS must work cooperatively to identify the appropriate goals for higher education in Maine.

Values
• Costs of higher education to the consumer
• Public value of education
• Obligation to help those in need
• Fairness

*We have to find a balance among conflicting values to make progress toward our goals. We can’t ignore important values. But when we get tangled up in value conflicts and lose sight of our goals, we get stuck. When we balance values well, we not only get things done, we get them done right.*

Strategies
Strategies are broad scale, general plans to reach well defined goals.

Institutional strategies include:
• Creating institutions with public, philanthropic, or investment capital
• Supporting institutions with direct public subsidies
• Supporting institutions with indirect public subsidies – student vouchers, tax exemptions, student aid, etc.

Revenue generating strategies include:
• Charging tuition
• Seeking donations
• Selling services

Marketing strategies include:
• Low tuition to encourage enrollment
• Grants to students who cannot pay tuition
• Grants or discounts to especially desirable students
• Loans, both subsidized and non-subsidized
• Supporting K-12 to improve student preparation
**Tactics**

Tactics are what we do to implement strategies to reach goals. In general, tactics are categorized as:

- Hierarchy (command and control)
- Bureaucracy (regulation, contracts, etc.)
- Market (supply and demand)

**Specific Budgeting Tactics**

- **Budget formulas** – providing resources according to “work-load” indicators, student enrollments, space occupied, research commitments, etc.
- **Base (plus or minus) budgeting** – assuming current funding as a starting point, then increasing it for inflation, new programs, new priorities, etc. or decreasing it due to service load changes, changing priorities, or insufficient revenues to sustain past funding.
- **Performance budgeting** – providing incentives or rewards for improvement, meeting goals, high quality results, etc. Can be used to provide sanctions for failing to reach performance targets.
- **Contracts for services** – negotiating budgets or agreeing on levels of funding based on the provision of specific services. (A new approach, somewhat like charter schools.)

Does the budget process:

- Provide continuity and predictability
- Allocate resources fairly
- Reflect changing conditions
- Encourage productivity gains, and
- Work smoothly and efficiently

**In Conclusion:**

**Why is higher education budgeting tough, why does it matter so much, and what should we do?**

*Higher education has a special problem in budgeting because our “product,” advancing and transmitting knowledge, has no upper limit in quality or quantity. We reward institutional leaders for raising money, and virtually every institution finds it possible to spend, for reasonably good purposes, all available resources.*
III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP

The issue of accountability and performance obviously overlaps each of the other strategic directions contained in the UMS Strategic Plan. To ensure consistency and continuity, an iterative approach between the work of this committee and the others must be conducted. However, before one can begin the work of interacting with the other strategic directions, the refinement and determination of the System’s goals, values, strategies, and tactics must first be completed before extending them to the individual universities.

IV. GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

To continue the momentum of the committee’s work, the following steps were agreed upon:

1. Over the summer, a subcommittee of the group consisting of the Chancellor, President Pattenaude, Joanne Yestramski, and Jim Breece would convene to refine the goals, values, strategies, and tactics as discussed by the committee; using the recommendations noted above.

2. The refinements will be shared with the full committee.

3. The full committee will meet again in September 2005 to discuss the refinements.

4. The full committee will then develop a work plan for the 05/06 academic year.

The committee is on track to having a complete set of recommendations by June 2006 on the following goals as presented in the Implementation Planning Process document:

- Strengthen institutional research capacity and focus on it as a System, in order that research can be conducted that will be useful in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of all universities.

- Set clear goals and objectives for financial management for each university and the System Office.

- Renew capital assets to maintain and upgrade UMS facilities so that they meet regulatory requirements and overall modernization needs and, in situations where space is unavailable or current space cannot be modified, fund new construction.

- Collect, analyze, and evaluate data such as enrollment, retention, and graduation rates, based on benchmark goals set for each institution, that are consistent with its mission and Carnegie classification.
- Utilize a campus-based Academic Program Planning (APP) model for program review, assessment, and development, based on the outcomes in Strategic Direction #1.

- Evaluate each institutional leader based on the progress made in achieving the goals and priorities set for each institution in its strategic plan, which must be consistent with the University of Maine System’s strategic planning priorities and must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

- Establish a performance-based funding component of funding.

*Detailed appendices of the Committee’s work are available upon request.*
I. Preface

Human Resources in the University of Maine System: opportunities for quality improvements, efficiencies and cost savings

In order to understand the recommendations of the Implementation Committee for Strategic Direction 7, Human Resources (HR), it is essential to understand the current state of HR in UMS and the opportunities for substantial improvement of service and cost savings that may require up front investments in infrastructure and adequate staff. The potential long-term savings in terms of increased productivity, reduced liability, improved retention, and employee morale far outweigh the needed investments. While there are process and program improvements that can result in lower transaction costs, the focus in human resources should be expanded to include true added value and reduced risk.

Current Organization of Human Resources

Human Resources is currently more centralized than many other functions in UMS. This results from several circumstances:

- UMS is legally one employer; therefore the University System is responsible for compliance with employment, non-discrimination and tax laws and regulations.
- Under the University of Maine System Labor Relations Act collective bargaining units and contracts are system-wide. Collective bargaining negotiations and grievance arbitration are conducted at the System level.
- Employee benefits programs apply to all employees System-wide. Benefit plan design, contract negotiation, payment of premiums and vendor management all occur at the System level.
- Human Resources was the first module of PeopleSoft to be implemented. In addition, the administrative computer system that preceded PeopleSoft had been put in place in 1998, so that data management procedures were largely standardized even before the PeopleSoft project.
- Human Resources functions operate in an integrated organizational model at the university level. Rather than having separate departments for payroll, benefits, labor relations, and other functions, HR is integrated into one department at the System and at each university. Thus, some of the “silos” that exist in other operational areas are less of a problem in HR. [At most UMS universities, the equal opportunity (EO) function is separated from HR because of the need for
checks and balances, the need for high level reporting for the EO function, and because EO also has a significant role in working with students. The relationship between HR and EO will be strengthened by some of the recommendations made by the Implementation Committee.

- Payroll processes are centrally managed with banking, withholding, reporting, and execution of payroll programs at the System level.

These central processes serve UMS well and for the most part no-one advocates for decentralization. The financial and operational pluses of one set of collective bargaining agreements and one set of employee benefit programs are clear.

While the UMS HR function is more centralized than many other functions, each university HR department is nonetheless 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.

**Opportunities for Quality Improvements and Cost Savings**

The human resources area is one of high risk for every employer. Salaries, wages and benefits represent a large proportion of the UMS budget. Consequently it is imperative that employees are productive and that salary, wage and benefit levels are competitive without being wasteful. The appropriate measure of effectiveness is not simply at the level of staffing and transaction costs, but at the outcomes.

Another potentially high cost related to human resources is the cost of complaints and suits 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. Minimizing these long range costs requires investments in HR and EO services.

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. Some of these recommendations require additional staff and other resources to strengthen the HR/EO infrastructure. These recommendations should be
reviewed with an eye on the potential long-term savings, rather than the relatively modest investments need to implement them.

II. Process

The Implementation Committee for SD 7, Human Resources, consists of all UMS HR Directors and Equal Opportunity Directors plus System Office of Human Resources Directors, a faculty member and a student. A list of members is attached. David Scheidt, Manager of Organizational Development and Employee Education at the University of Maine, was enormously helpful as a facilitator to the group.

The Implementation Committee held two full-day meetings. The work of the committee was informed by preliminary work accomplished by a sub-group that held two full-day exploratory retreats before the Implementation Committee was appointed and charged. The preliminary work included developing an inventory of HR/EO services, a listing of hallmarks of quality service, criteria for identifying functions that might be good candidates to examine for centralization, and a continuum of service models from the current model to varying degrees of greater integration, coordination and centralization.

This preliminary work was very useful to the Implementation Committee which then adopted a list of services/functions to be explored for centralization or integration. The Committee also identified areas of intersection between human resources and the other strategic directions. Sub-committees were formed to develop a first draft of the “Centralization/Integration Opportunities” (C/I O’s) that are described below and attached as our recommendations. The C/I O’s were posted on a Blackboard site for review by the full committee. The full Implementation Committee then met to discuss and refine the C/I O’s, organize our work for next year, and identify the themes for the Preface to this report.

Committee members were assisted by the Employee Development Task Force. The Task Force reviewed issues of employee development across all HR functional areas. This Task Force was established by the System, with members appointed by presidents, to recommend how to improve employee development throughout UMS. In establishing the Task Force UMS recognized the importance of employee development as a risk mitigation strategy. The Task Force was initially recommended by the Risk Assessment and Review Advisory Committee and the idea was endorsed by the Board of Trustees Audit Committee and the presidents.

III. Improvement Opportunities

The recommendations of the committee are presented in the attached “Centralization/Integration Opportunities.” For each proposed process change there is a brief description of the current state, the vision, factors that could enable or inhibit change, and implications for technology.
IV. Work for the Next Year

If the committee receives approval to proceed in our work, we will further develop the centralization/integration opportunities. In some cases there is a clear consensus about what should be done and how to proceed. For those recommendations we can start more detailed planning in order to be prepared to implement the changes upon final approval. For other processes we need to further explore the options and determine the best way to move forward. In these areas we have a broad consensus that improvement is needed, but we do not have a clear vision of the future state.

As a way to educate ourselves, the Committee will look at practices at other universities, especially at university systems. Through contact with other universities we can learn how functions are integrated and what the advantages and disadvantages are.

Technology could be a major enabler of change for HR. The Committee will coordinate with the UMS group that is considering the implementation of document management technology. The availability of document management would greatly facilitate change in a number of HR functions outlined in the C/I O’s. We will also watch developments in workflow technology and the added features that will be available when we upgrade to a new PeopleSoft version. In addition there are PeopleSoft modules that we currently own but are not yet using that could enable change. Applicant management and tracking (e-Recruit) is an example of this.

A key component of our work will be to involve more people. Our process moving forward will include more HR and EO staff at the university and System level. We will benefit from involving those who know the details of the hands on work better than we may. In addition, we will seek employee (and retiree) input, perhaps through surveys or focus groups. We need to understand employee perceptions of the quality of service, accuracy and adequacy of information, and preferred modes of receiving services.

Between now and next fall the committee will continue to work on several aspects of implementation. We will determine how to most effectively involve employee input. The Employee Development Task Force, working both as a part of this Implementation Committee and as charged by the Risk Assessment and Review Advisory Committee, will continue its work of conducting baseline measurements for a needs assessment and an inventory of existing programs. We will also build a schedule for meetings for the fall and determine what parts of our work may be conducted using technology such as compressed video and Blackboard.

V. Links to Other Strategic Directions

Linkages to other strategic direction that the Committee identified are attached. All aspects of the Strategic Plan have potential impacts on employees, and consequently it is important that HR be involved.
VI. Workforce Management

Implementation of the Strategic Plan is a major change management initiative for the University of Maine System. There are potential impacts on the number and type of positions needed, the locations where they are needed, and employee development required. In order for change to be successfully implemented, communication and involvement of employees and other constituents is essential. Some of the impacts on employment are likely to require negotiation with employee bargaining agents.

A separate work product of the Implementation Committee was a set of proposed workforce management policies that have been recommended to the Chancellor and presidents. These policies will avoid or reduce any negative impact on employees from implementation of the plan. These policies will be proposed in collective bargaining and put in place for non-represented employees as implementation proceeds.

VII. Recommendations for Immediate Implementation

The Committee identified one area of possible improvement that we recommend for immediate implementation. We recommend adoption of a System-wide policy for background checks at the time of hiring for certain positions. Credit, criminal, and driving records should uniformly be reviewed for appropriate positions. For example, financially sensitive positions and positions that will provide wide access to facilities should be subject to credit and criminal checks. Positions that have responsibility for driving vehicles should be subject to a driving record check. Required educational degrees should be verified. Current practice is not consistent across the System. We recommend that a System-wide policy be adopted without delay.

VIII. Preliminary Recommendations

1 - Background checks for new employees

System Office should conduct background checks for all universities to ensure that prospective new employees have the skills and other qualifications required to perform the job and to reduce risk exposure due to negligent hiring.

2 - Immigration

This function would be centralized to increase in-house expertise, reduce the risk of violations, and improve service to affected employees. A System Office or campus expert would be designated to handle employee immigration issues for all the universities.

3 A full analysis of the Committee’s recommendations is available upon request.
3 - Search support

Employing best people by sharing best search practices. System Office coordination of joint electronic recruiting, optional shared print advertising, inter-university cooperation at job fairs, and common broad search policies that can be tailored to university needs.

4 - Staff development

It is imperative that UMS expand staff development programs to help employees acquire skills needed for their jobs and to help manage areas of high risk. Supervisory and management development, financial management and safety training, and legally mandated training should be developed and delivered by integrating HR and EO staff system-wide to share available resources.

5 - HR reports

SWS should continue in lead role for mandatory and management reports and should take a leadership role in helping universities define their reporting needs, providing an inventory of ad hoc reports for use by universities, and providing training and direct service to universities for complex queries and reports. This will improve the timeliness and quality of HR reports for use in management decision-making.

6 - Benefits services

Provide accurate, timely, complete information about benefits programs and responses to employee questions so that employees appropriately utilize available benefits. Further analysis is needed to determine most effective way to reach this state.

7 - HR data entry and data integrity

Accurate data entry using standardized protocols and procedures and latest tools and shortcuts. Further analysis is needed to recommend the most effective way to achieve this state.

8 - Surveys and research

Centralize responses to selected local surveys from which UMS benefits by participating. Research should be completed by those closest to and with the best understanding of the required information.
9 – Wellness

Expanded wellness programs should lead over time to lower health care costs. New externally funded position of SWS Wellness Manager will work with universities to strengthen local programming.

10 - Compensation program design and maintenance

Establish a group of highly qualified compensation specialists in SWS to provide the dedicated resources needed to recommend, implement, and maintain effective compensation programs that will attract and retain highly qualified staff. University HR offices will continue to play a significant role in program design but will be relieved of the burden of doing time-consuming detail work and will have more time to focus on high-level services.

11 - Job classification (includes employee reclassification requests, classification of new and vacant positions for both hourly and salaried non-faculty positions)

A team of compensation/classification specialists in SWS will provide classification services for UMS universities, with one at SWS and others regionally dispersed. University HR office will contact SWS classification/compensation team, which will conduct all position reviews and appropriately classify positions.

12 - Salaries requiring Chancellor approval

Establish policies for salary ranges or ceilings for positions in designated categories. Universities work with OHR to recommend to Chancellor policies that will: identify groups that should be covered by policies, propose approved salary ranges/ceilings, and specify factors for determining salary. Campuses will know from the outset that they have approval to make offers within the range established in the approved policy. These changes would not replace Chancellor review of the final hiring recommendation or Board of Trustees approval of Management Group appointments.

13 – Workplace violence, domestic violence and harassment

UMS will be a safer workplace for all by adopting a policy prohibiting workplace violence, harassment, and support for victims of domestic violence and using the policy to strengthen current integrated case management approach to incident response.
HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN

Each Strategic Direction of the UMS Strategic Plan calls for changes in the university that will affect employees and may require collective bargaining. Campus and System Office human resources and equal opportunity directors have identified the following broad HR impacts of each Strategic Direction for consideration by the designated committee.

**Strategic Direction 1** – Academic quality, academic program planning

- Faculty:student and staff:student ratios and student enrollment targets may require increased staffing levels
- Increases in staffing levels will require more searches to support/monitor, require effective integration into university
- Academic program closings will result in layoffs, redeployments, and/or other personnel actions that impact faculty/staff and may require impact bargaining

**Strategic Direction 2** – Faculty, staff development

- Implementation of compensation targets will require collective bargaining
- Changes in criteria for review of faculty performance may require collective bargaining
- Faculty and staff development is a focus of Strategic Direction 7, Human Resources

**Strategic Direction 3** – Distance education

- Faculty/administrative committees addressing issues that affect faculty assignments, workload, and compensation must be cognizant of collective bargaining obligations
- Impact on faculty morale

**Strategic Direction 4** – Libraries

- May require more creative HR policies to be able to share positions with external libraries, enable telecommuting, etc.
- Impact on morale at campuses not designated as the research library

**Strategic Direction 5** – Research

- May require more flexibility in funding options for research positions
- Externally funded research positions will pose challenges for equity with internal compensation programs
- Increased research faculty hiring will require more HR/EO support and guidance
- Potential for workload inequities
- Incentive programs to encourage research/creativity will require collective bargaining

**Strategic Direction 6 – Accountability**

- Accountability requires effective performance management, training, and performance assessment programs for administrators, supervisors, and staff
- Implies pay-for-performance rewards which must be carefully designed to be effective and which must be collectively bargained
- Greater scrutiny to ensure each position is aligned with unit/university goals could lead to layoffs, redeployment of staff resource, need for cross training

**Strategic Direction 7**

- Success in implementing aspects of Strategic Direction 7 for Human Resources depends on the availability of new technology such as document management and workflow.

**Strategic Direction 8 – Restructuring**

- Merger will lead to many impacts that must be bargained
- More UMS involvement in university decisions about resource allocation affects shared governance, faculty/staff morale
- Redeploying resources may entail layoffs, reassignments, retraining
- Many workforce management strategies require collective bargaining
I. Overview

The THESIS (Transforming Higher Education Student Integrated Services) project was launched in January. Much has been accomplished through the work of an eleven-member Core Team, which has been assisted by Thundercloud Consultants, and a fourteen-member Executive Advisory Committee. Three members of the Chancellor’s senior staff, the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, the Chief Financial Officer, and the Chief of Staff, have functioned as Executive Sponsors, regularly consulting with Core Team and Executive Advisory Committee leadership.

The THESIS groups produced an Interim Report that was endorsed by the seven university presidents and shared with the Board of Trustees on April 15, 2005. This report included an analysis of business processes in the following areas: Advising; Registration and Student Records; Financial Aid; Bursar, Loan Processing and Receivables Management. In each instance, process maps identified areas of work that could be centralized across the System and areas that needed to remain on the campuses. The report also included a vision for the transformation of student services and a set of underlying, guiding assumptions.

Since then, the THESIS groups have produced a second Interim Report, which was shared with the seven university presidents and the UMS senior staff on May 23, 2005. This report included information about best practices nationally, organizational design options, preliminary data to build a business case, and recommendations for the organization of remaining work.

II. Preliminary Recommendations

The Presidents endorsed the following recommendations from the THESIS Executive Advisory Committee:

1) **Immediate** attention needs to be given to the design and implementation of common policies and procedures (to permit the Enterprise project to move...
forward AND to allow Peoplesoft to support THESIS). A list of current “sticking points” needs to be developed; the Presidents, CAO’s, and CFO’s need to communicate a commitment to resolving these, and in some cases may need to take action themselves. (Editorial Note: care will need to be exercised with differences closely related to mission and with matters potentially impinging on faculty governance)

2) We need to commit to the design principles contained in THESIS Interim Report I—i.e., “above-the-line” processes that need to remain on the campuses and “below-the-line,” back-office processes that can reasonably be centralized. This needs to be a firm commitment, i.e., a destination that the UMS resolves to reach. However, the implementation of central services will evolve gradually, as will the design of central services.

3) We need to proceed as quickly as possible to:

   a. The development of campus one-stops (“Student desks” that link front-office service in financial aid, bursar, and registrar’s operations);
   b. The enhancement of web-based, self-service options;
   c. The development of a Center (a single location to be determined) that will assume responsibility for “low hanging fruit” items from the “below-the-line” processes—e.g., perhaps loan collection and receivable management, certain data entry and paper handling, student billing. (Note: as centralized services gradually become more robust, form will follow function—i.e., there will be opportunities to consider what needs to move to a central location, what can be done in a more distributed or virtual manner, etc.)

4) In order to accomplish the items listed in #3, we must:

   a. Link the development of new student service delivery operations to the Peoplesoft implementation calendar;
   b. Be clear that one of our goals is cost removal (the other is the improvement of student services);
   c. Revalidate the “speeds and feeds” data in order to have an accurate understanding of our starting point (FTE positions currently required to deliver student services).
   d. Commit to making rapid progress with the purchase, installation, and training on a document management system that provides us with imaging, indexing, and workflow capabilities.

5) A Time-Line Taskforce needs to be convened to discuss recommendations for organizing the work required to begin THESIS implementation. This taskforce will be chaired the chairs of the Core Team and Executive Advisory Committee, with membership from both groups.
6) The Executive Advisory Committee and Core Team will need to reconvene some time over the summer of 2005 to consider recommendations from the Taskforce and to begin to develop implementation plans.

III. Areas of Overlap

The main areas of overlap include:

Strategic Direction #1: Co-location of university and community college resources; development and improvement of academic support services.

Strategic Direction #3: On-line and Center support for distance-learning students.

Other portions of Strategic Direction #7: Enterprise Resource Planning; Human resources management.

Strategic Direction #6: Goals and objectives for financial management; facilities planning for campus one-stop student service centers.

Strategic Direction #8: Development of UMPI, UMFK, UMM consortium; possible development of UMA, USM merger; future plans for University College Centers.

IV. Goals for Next Steps

The next steps involve follow-through on the recommendations listed in Section II. This work has already begun.

In addition, THESIS planners will need to work closely with the UMS Human Resources Office to continue to develop appropriate workforce management plans. The Interim Report II included various analyses of potential or theoretical savings from the efficiencies to be gained through centralization and campus one-stop student service centers. These analyses, though preliminary, were sufficient to demonstrate the potential of savings, but substantial design work remains to be done. It is clear that any reductions in force and impacts on current personnel will be gradual, with opportunities to handle these primarily through attrition management and secondarily through other workforce management approaches.

The University of Maine System currently has a grant proposal pending with the Davis Educational Foundation. This proposal, if funded, will provide support for the first stages of THESIS implementation. We expect a response from Davis by mid-June.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 7 – BUSINESS OPERATIONS:

First Report

June 5, 2005

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.

Overview:

The University of Maine System Chief Financial Officers meet routinely at least four times a year as a group, either in person or more recently, by polycom. Therefore, it is considered to be an “existing committee” with reference to the Strategic Plan. The CFO’s have and will continue to work collaboratively as a group to implement efficiency initiatives, all in the spirit of maximizing limited resources available to the University of Maine System.

As outlined in the UMS Strategic Plan – Strategic Direction #7, the System is committed to increasing cost savings through the strategic leveraging of resources and increased effectiveness of service through expanded administrative support services, where appropriate. As far back as 1996, the System began exploring the acquisition of a new student information system due to the inadequacy of the current legacy systems and the ongoing, stand-alone, fragmented efforts to address these issues. In 2001 the Board of Trustees approved the acquisition of an Enterprise Resource Planning System to provide a software solution integrating information and business processes to enable sharing throughout the organization of information entered once in a database. The implementation of this suite of software, along with other new software tools referred to throughout this report, have enhanced the CFO’s ability to collaboratively implement efficiency initiatives. Therefore, Strategic Direction #7 endorsed work already in progress.

The purpose of this report is to outline the efficiency initiatives centered around business services at the University of Maine System, with reference to overlapping strategic initiatives covered by other SD#7 reports (i.e., information technology, human resources and student administrative services).

Progress made to date:

Simply said, the goal of the efficiency initiatives outlined below is to produce cost savings, cost avoidance or revenue enhancement now and
in the future which can be reallocated to fund strategic initiatives outlined in the Strategic Plan.
FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING

In conjunction with the implementation of the PeopleSoft general ledger module (go-live date is July 5, 2005), the University of Maine System’s accounting and finance offices have been reorganized, job descriptions have been updated, and business processes have been rewritten to take advantage of the functionality of this robust accounting system.

The System Finance and Accounting services are in the process of:

- Implementing the new PeopleSoft General Ledger system. Improved functionality includes:
  - More efficient transaction processing with online approvals resulting in less paper
  - Additional budget fields for more robust planning and modeling
  - Enhanced reporting tools, particularly “G/L inquiry reporting” with drill down features to the actual posted transaction
  - Streamlined year-end closing functionality which will eliminate the off-ledger “shadow system” currently used
  - Robust account structure which will provide for improved financial analysis and reporting
  - Full integration (as compared to interfaced) with all the PeopleSoft applications as they come on-line over the next several years
  - Integration with Position Management providing improved workforce management, financial reporting, and financial planning

- Filling the position of System Controller to strengthen the overall accountability of all financial operations system-wide. The Controller’s function would –
  - Enhance the ability of our accounting staff to keep pace with accounting and regulatory changes given the growth, size and complexity of the University of Maine System. UMS is a $600 million operation with significant growth in the Sponsored Programs area and expanding centralized services
  - Accommodate the change in attitude in the industry toward who is responsible and accountable for financial reporting (i.e., management rather than the auditing firm).
- Provide oversight of accounting operations on the campuses, and the need for one individual to have a comprehensive understanding, from an accounting standpoint, of all financial information institution wide, including interaction with affiliated organizations and foundations.

- Play a key role in the implementation of accountability and performance measures expected to be an outcome of Strategic Direction #6 in the UMS Strategic Plan.

KPMG, the audit committee and management believe filling the position of System Controller as soon as possible will produce a quick payback given the risks involved of not having this key position filled.

PURCHASING

In conjunction with the implementation of PeopleSoft’s purchasing/accounts payable/expense modules (go-live date is July 5, 2005), the current Strategic Procurement Department has been formed from existing resources and is evolving to:

- Implement, maintain and provide training for new PeopleSoft Purchasing & Accounts Payable system, including e-procurement applications. Increased functionality includes:
  - The ability for departments to see from their desktops exactly where their requisitions are in the process, as well as whether invoicing, receiving and payments have occurred.
  - Purchase Orders can now be faxed or emailed directly from the Purchasing System without human intervention.
  - Increased controls over disbursements: Positive Pay - electronically send to the bank a file of all checks that get produced every pay cycle before any checks get disbursed.
  - Checks being printed from PeopleSoft instead of Standard Register (when issues arise during a payables process our technical staff can resolve them rather than being dependent on a third party.)
  - Preventing Accounts Payable staff from inadvertently paying freight bills where those costs have already been negotiated out of the purchase.
  - Interfaces with other business systems (bookstores, library, work order systems etc.) will eliminate duplicate entry of data throughout UMS.
  - On-line Travel and Expense module will provide on-line approvals, analytical data needed to obtain discounted travel arrangements and out-of state travel reports.
Maximize purchasing economies of scale, mandate common commodity purchases, require computer purchases to be centralized and procured according to standards, when appropriate, established by IT Policy and Planning Committee.

Coordinate computer sales and services including assisting in planning, acquisition, licensing and disposal of technology products.

Provide synergy with other support services (information technology, facilities, energy and environment, electronic banking, travel management and reimbursement, collaborative ancillary software purchases).

Continually investigate and implement state-of-the-art purchasing practices, technology, and lease/purchase options.

Provide oversight of the procurement card system including training compliance, self-audit, rebate management.

Collaborate with other higher-education institutions and with the State.

Establish and monitor purchasing policies and procedures; overall increased empowerment for purchasing as a centralized function.

Coordinate a System-wide RFP for food services for the six campuses (all but UM) which currently have outsourced their food service operations.

**FACILITIES AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

To manage, enhance, and protect the System’s valuable facilities, assets, comprising nearly nine million square feet of building area, the System Office of Facilities provides guidance, expertise, and facilities management experience to all the Universities. This office includes managers in the fields of safety and environment, facilities inventory, real estate, risk management, legislative affairs, energy, and project management. Some recent activities that directly support the objectives of Strategic Direction #7 include:

- Established the System Energy Team, bringing together representatives of the large and small campuses, as well as System purchasing staff, Community College and Maine Maritime Academy staff, and State energy personnel, all in an effort to manage the difficult task of promoting energy conservation and collaboratively acquiring energy supplies.

- Planned and hosted, on the USM campus, an Energy Summit, aimed primarily at educational institutions, which included presenters from across the nation and focused on a multitude of issues and concerns in managing energy need.
• Provided centralized management and guidance to all campuses in the data gathering and management of the VFA facilities condition assessment software, thereby enabling the first comprehensive campus and system-wide analysis of the critical deferred maintenance backlog

FINANCING ALTERNATIVES AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT

Creative solutions to financing alternatives are constantly being reviewed and brought to the attention of the Finance/Facilities committee of the Board of Trustees, when appropriate. Financing alternatives and funding solutions reviewed and/or implemented more recently include:

- Grant applications for efficiency initiatives (i.e., Davis Foundation, USDA, US Department of Energy)

- Privatized financing for residential hall construction (reviewed with the finance committee in January 2005)

- Lease/purchase option for equipment (LD 746 hoped to provide this alternative by eliminating the business property tax for public higher education institutions but was voted ought not to pass, despite attempts to persuade the Taxation Committee that this would not mean a loss of revenue to municipalities as UMS currently does not lease equipment in any meaningful way. Also, K-12 and non-profit health care institutions already have this business property tax exemption)

- Maximize the ability for campuses to borrow internally at low interest rates on projects with quick paybacks

- Increase the revenue bonding cap for the University of Maine System by $50 million to $220 million

- Gift annuities introduced and administered by System treasury management

- Funding through vendors, including the RFP for food services, to improve campus dining facilities

- Continued efforts to obtain state bond financing for high priority capital projects which do not have funding for debt service; through the VFA facility assessment study and updated capital planning, began preparing for a large state bond request to fund renovation, renewal and deferred maintenance
Maximizing the return on endowment and operating investments through active management with the advice and council of the UMS Investment Committee and outside independent advisor. Also, provide an incentive program for cash management at the university level

**Key areas of Overlap:**

Overlap areas with other strategic planning initiatives include other initiatives under Strategic Direction #7 – Information Technology, Human Resources and Student Administrative Services; Strategic Direction # 9 Funding and Advocacy; and Strategic Direction #6 Accountability.

A companion document to this report and other reports under Strategic Direction #7, *System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities*, is attached. This is a living document to be updated regularly in conjunction with the implementation of the Strategic Plan. The purpose of this document is to explore both the current and potentially expanded future role of the System’s administrative support services working in partnership with each of the universities to ensure that quality services are being provided by the most effective and efficient means available.

The System Office relocation to downtown Bangor, enabled by the exchange of land for renovated space in City owned facilities, will occur on or about October 1st 2005. The consolidation of four office facilities into this newly renovated facility, appropriately designed for the service requirements of our universities, will facilitate the efficiencies, coordination and increased productivity of the System’s administrative support services noted in the document *System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities*

**Goals for Next Steps:**

The Chief Financial Officers will continue to meet routinely to facilitate the effective implementation of the PeopleSoft administrative software system as well as the other efficiency initiatives outlined in this report. Potential future efficiency initiatives being discussed and included in the document *System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities* include:

- Enhanced cash management at the campus level, including incentive programs, and fraud prevention measures
- Take a fresh look at the process for preparing and monitoring budgets, given new reporting tools, better analytical information, changing accounting methods, and challenging financial times
- Perform business process reviews (“BPR”) on the only two areas associated with the PeopleSoft modules which have not yet undergone
BPR – Sponsored Programs and Contributor Relations. It is hoped that BPR in these two areas may streamline administration for sponsored programs and back-office gift processing and reporting.

- Consider expanding centralized project management services for capital construction projects, especially for the smaller campuses where occasional project management needs place a significant burden.

- Perform a needs assessment for facilities software requirements in order to streamline and coordinate space planning, facilities conditioning, and work order administration.

Other statewide efficiency initiatives which could result in cost savings for higher education:

- Further consolidation of endowment investment management

- Once the UMS has stabilized its administrative systems, consult with leadership from the Maine Community College System and Maine Maritime Academy to determine the feasibility of partnerships that would allow the UMS to share the PeopleSoft administrative software system.

Finally, in conjunction with the implementation of Strategic Direction #6 – Accountability - goals, objectives and performance measures will be established for key System Services to assure prudent stewardship and incremental savings are achieved from the efficiency initiatives outlined in this report.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 7 – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:
First Report
June 5, 2005

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.

Overview:

The IT Policy and Planning Committee of the University of Maine System, chaired by President Rich Pattenaude, was formed in June 2003 to act as a surrogate Chief Information Officer and facilitate system wide Information Technology efficiency initiatives. Around the same time, the UMS received $3 million in state bond funding for IT efficiency initiatives and it has also been the responsibility of this committee to prioritize spending for IT projects funded by this bond. The Committee meets routinely every two months, either in person or more recently, by polycom. Therefore, it is considered to be an “existing committee” with reference to the Strategic Plan Strategic Direction #7. In collaboration with the Universities and a newly hired Chief Information Officer for the UMS, the Committee, as part of its on-going responsibilities, will continue to oversee the implementation of efficiency initiatives, all in the spirit of maximizing limited resources available to the University of Maine System.

Without a CIO for the University of Maine System, there has not existed a “higher authority” to oversee information technology planning and policies, risks, funding, standards and uniformity of delivery systems. A recent internal audit report on the UMS compliance with the Gramm-Leach Bliley Act articulated the need for a higher IT authority:

“...The UMS IT Organization does not currently have the authority, mission, or mandate to implement or require many of the best IT practices, including security practices, for the Universities. While IT should serve the user community and adapt to the user’s needs, some aspects of IT are better managed with a single, unified IT Authority. Absent a single strategic direction, each Department, campus and organization throughout the UMS is free to assess, develop, purchase and operate a different system which, while perhaps uniquely suited to its own needs, does not allow for the economies of scale that an organization the size of UMS should expect.”

The task at hand now to implement these efficiencies, standardizations and consolidations, after many years without a CIO, looms large for UMS but if and when accomplished, significant cost savings will be achieved.

The purpose of this report is to outline the efficiency initiatives of the Committee which have been accomplished or are projects in progress as well as potential plans for the
future, with reference to overlapping strategic initiatives covered by other SD#7 reports (i.e., business services, human resources and student administrative services).

**Progress made to date:**

Simply said, the joint purposes of the efficiency initiatives outlined below are to achieve cost savings/avoidance while simultaneously enhancing functionality and service in order to provide funds and support for the Strategic Plan. Ongoing, effective information technology management practices must be employed to help reduce costs as well as leverage resources institution-wide.

As these projects and programs are designed and implemented, it is essential to retain the proper level of functionality and autonomy at the campus level. This can be a delicate balance which varies by area, thus there must be ongoing dialogue, involving senior officials on the University campuses as well as the many action committees. A healthy system depends upon a dynamic balance of efficient centralized support services and entrepreneurial and creative campuses. This balance will be addressed regularly to ensure that the system and the campuses remain aligned in their goals and actions.

The following IT efficiency initiatives, with encouragement and oversight provided by the Committee, are completed, under discussion or are in progress:

System-wide wireless network –
- Funded by the State IT bond
- Provided a consistent, uniform wireless network for the entire University of Maine System
- Via a commonly administered authentication system, allows all UMS faculty, students and staff to roam throughout all UMS properties using their laptops in a wireless environment
- K-12 laptops can also be accommodated on UMS premises
  (Note: due to some infrastructure upgrade requirements, UM is only 90% complete as of this writing)

Video conferencing for Collaboration –
- Funded by the State IT bond
- During the past year, implemented video conferencing system for administrative uses for all campuses
- Provided common standards, common equipment and centrally managed scheduling
- Use of the system has grown immensely, with many system wide committees and meetings held via video conferencing rather than traveling to a central location

Centralized management for Network infrastructure for all university locations -
UNET currently provides local area network infrastructure and technical support for UMPI, UMFK, UMM and parts of UM.

- Service level agreement in process to extend network support for entire UM campus in accordance with recommendation of Commission on Information Technology Report dated Nov 2003 (http://dll.umaine.edu/cd)

- Committee established with representatives from UM, UMF and USM to study the present delivery of and make a recommendation on the future delivery of Network and Telephone services throughout the UMS.

- Significant efficiencies and savings may be possible in the areas of:
  - Cabling infrastructure
  - Networking equipment and servers
  - Maintenance of equipment
  - Centralized and expert staffing
  - Controlled and secured environments for critical servers (currently located within departments) stored centrally
  - Leverage the network for voice, video, and data technology

Telephony enhancements –
- Funded by the State IT bond
- Using the UMS high speed statewide Wide Area Network, a telephony enhancement has been in process to eliminate intercampus tolls, cost of local calls, and in some locations, alternative technologies have been utilized including voice over IP.
- This technology may minimize the need to replace expensive traditional telephone switches, currently identified as campus capital needs totaling some $1 million.
- UMFK, UMPI, UMA, and System offices are installed or planned to be installed (i.e., new Bangor headquarters)
- The Networking Committee referred to above is exploring how to expand access to the larger campuses (UM, USM and UMF). For greatest efficiencies, all campus switches must be able to accept and deliver calls over the University’s wide area network.

Enterprise Software (other than core PeopleSoft administrative system) –
- Funded by the State IT bond and acquired at the system level via campus wide licensing and realizing significant economies of scale.
- Room management system software
  - Interfaces with PeopleSoft
  - UM and USM implemented
  - UMFK, UMPI, UMFK and UMM in process – 2006 targeted completion
  - Common servers, training and implementation team

- Document management system - vendor selection in progress
  - Common solution to imaging system wide for student administration, human resources and other business services
- Reduce cost by eliminating manual handling, filing, and retrieval of documents
- Easy retrieval from multiple locations
- Integrated with legacy and ERP systems
- Provides for long-term reliable storage of documents without expensive storage space

- VFA facilities assessment software, implemented in fall 2004, enabled the UMS facility directors to determine system wide deferred maintenance needs using consistent protocol

- Travel and expense module – go-live date July 5, 2005
  - Integrated PeopleSoft solution
  - Will provide on-line approvals, automated out-of-state travel reports, analytical data needed for use in obtaining discounted travel arrangements

- Simplified reporting solution to enhance fund-raising activities

- Web-site reengineering to produce a more efficient, more customer friendly system website – project in process led by John Diamond

- During summer 2004, system wide purchase/license of anti-virus software for all faculty, staff and students at home and on campus

IT procurement coordination with overall goal to lower the “total cost of ownership” of desktop computing for the UMS and other education institutions in Maine -

- Aggregate system-wide licensing
- Negotiate most aggressive desktop hardware and software pricing
- Minimize number of vendors and products and provide e-procurement over the web
- Facilitate enforcement of standards
- Simplify tracing of technology expenditures
- In process – to reorganize Computer Connection under System office Strategic Procurement department and consolidate IT procurement

Other technology standards -

- Determine common e-commerce services such as receivable and payable solutions
  - Committee of business officers exploring opportunities which will integrate well with new PeopleSoft purchasing, accounts payable and student billing systems

- Coordinate fully integrated campus card initiative for all campuses which may include
  - Reduction of data entry redundancy
o Ability to share information between systems  
  o Convenience for users to have one card for many services, including banking services  
  o Committee of business officers being led by Benny Veenhof (UM director of their campus card) is exploring how to leverage the UM and USM investments in campus cards to the smaller campuses  
  o Seed money from the state bond allocated to this project

- Investigate and evaluate consolidating current multi-platform course management systems to a single platform for increased efficiencies in areas such as licensing, support and increased ease of student usage  
  o Committee led by Jim Patterson (Director of Hutchinson Center) being formed system-wide to determine current costs and functionality of the two primary vendor provided course management systems, with the goal of migrating to a single system/product by the time of the PeopleSoft records go live in summer 2007

- Establish system-wide IT policy manual  
  o Several policies have been drafted and are under discussion:  
    ▪ E-mail addresses  
    ▪ Wireless spectrum policy  
    ▪ Public access to UMS wireless system

Key Areas of Overlap:

Overlap areas with other strategic planning initiatives include other initiatives under Strategic Direction #7 – Business Services, Human Resources and Student Administrative Services; Strategic Direction #3 - Distance Education; and Strategic Direction #6 Accountability.

A companion document of this report and other reports under Strategic Direction #7, System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities, is attached. This is a living document to be updated regularly in conjunction with the implementation of the Strategic Plan. The purpose of this document is to explore both the current and potentially expanded future role of the System’s administrative support services working in partnership with each of the universities to ensure that quality services are being provided by the most effective and efficient means available.

Goals for Next Steps:

With the hiring of a new System Chief Information Officer, the IT Policy and Planning Committee will continue to meet routinely to facilitate the implementation of the
efficiency initiatives outlined in this report. Potential future efficiency initiatives being discussed and included in the document System Services: Supporting Maine’s Public Universities include:

- Upgrade distance education origination classrooms with the goal to make them more flexible and to reduce operational costs (will be funded by State IT bond)
- Implement a pilot for streaming video and video-on-demand system as an additional technology to deliver education (partially funded by State IT bond)
- Develop and support enterprise-wide applications for electronic communication and authentication systems (integrated messaging system)
  - Currently there are multiple e-mail servers in the UMS system
- Establish a system level IT customer service department which could include
  - Consolidation of multiple help desks
  - Enhancement/coordination of IT training (desktop best practices, PeopleSoft, telephony, video conferencing, course management system, etc.)
  - Basic and local issues will be continued to be serviced at campus level
- Establish and monitor safeguarding IT policies in accordance with recommendations of the Internal Audit report on Gramm-Leach Bliley Act, especially as regards customer credit card information
- Develop a long-term financial plan for information technology which is incorporated into UMS’s overall planning and budgeting processes for effective cost management.
- Work with the new CIO to review the campus and System IT legacy funding models

Other statewide efficiency initiatives which could result in cost savings for higher education:

- Integrate the Maine Community College System Wide Area Network into the existing University/Education/Research Network
- Pursue possibilities of continuing use of the educational frequency spectrum that is licensed to the UMS (microwave frequencies), by partnering with commercial wireless network providers as allowed by the FCC. The goal of such partnering is to reduce current operation costs while retaining current transport capacity
- Participate in statewide broadband and telecommunications task forces to promote the deployment of broadband access statewide which may reduce the cost of electronic delivery of education

Finally, in conjunction with the implementation of Strategic Direction #6 – Accountability – goals, objectives and performance measure will be established for Information Technology Services to assure prudent stewardship and incremental savings are achieved from the efficiency initiatives outlined in this report.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 – HIGHER EDUCATION PARK:
First Report
June 5, 2005

Strategic Direction 8 - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

I. OVERVIEW

Recent legislative actions regarding the UMA/USM merger and the establishment of the Governor’s Task Force to Plan for Higher Education in the Kennebec Valley (Task Force) to explore issues surrounding this proposed merger are superseding the actions of this committee. As a result, this constitutes a final report. It is recognized that this committee could be reinstated at a later date pending the outcome of the Governor’s Task Force. The membership list of the SD #8-Higher Education Park Implementation Planning committee is shown in Appendix A.

Strategic Direction #8 – Higher Education Park is defined in the UMS Plan as: Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

Components of the plan include paying careful attention to: (1) Simplifying/rationalizing the System and freeing up resources; (2) Enhancing students’ educational experience; (3) Build on strengths; (4) Utilize resources most effectively and efficiently; (4) Create a sustainable financial paradigm; (5) Enhance revenue generation; (6) Clarify decision-making parameters; and, (7) Link planning and budgeting. All of this to be accomplished in the specific context of a “Higher Education Park (HEP)” at the current location of the University College Bangor (a campus within the University of Maine at Augusta).
The Committee has met six (6) times and is composed of faculty, student and staff representatives from the University of Maine at Augusta (UMA-from both its Augusta and Bangor locations), University of Maine (UM), University of Southern Maine (USM), University of Maine System (UMS), and Eastern Maine Community College (EMCC). We decided early on to work as a committee of the whole with break out sessions when necessary and with the use of a skilled facilitator. The discussions were intense and cordial and with a clear sense of crafting out a successful outcome for all parties. The remainder of the report will address specific outcomes and recommendations that have been developed.
Concerns:

1. **Continuing current student access to higher education.** Many UMA/UCB students are nontraditional and first generation college students who often require enhanced student services to be academically successful. Concerns were expressed about the continuation of those student services, flexibility in programs and scheduling, and adequate financial support. There were also concerns over maintaining healthy enrollments and on degree-granting authority. Issues were also raised around the integration of the mission & vision of HEP over the short-term (5 years) with student needs and issues. A final concern was the issue of transfer between the institutions (i.e. how would students move from UMA/UCB/EMCC to UM, from UMA/UCB to EMCC, or from EMCC to UMA/UCB).

2. **Academic Programming:** Concerns exist over certificate programs, associate degrees and Bachelor’s degrees and overall program ownership and accreditation. Issues surrounding which institution is responsible for oversight/offering of an academic program, duplication of programs and services and which unit is responsible for degree conferral, are among the items of concern that require more in-depth examination.

3. **Faculty & Staff Assignment.** Although never addressed directly, there are concerns about the future positioning of faculty and staff as oversight of the campus is transferred to the University of Maine.
   
   There are numerous issues surrounding this topic that should be addressed in the future.

4. **Ongoing Operations.** During the transition phase and permanent operations, concerns exist over the management of ongoing programs, faculty assignments, administration, infrastructure and finances. These, too, will need to be addressed in more depth.

5. **Sequence and Timing of Events.** The concerns here are straightforward —what would be the specific timeline around programs, recruitment, staffing, degree transfer, etc. as we move to a new concept of UMA/UCB.
In response to SD #8, the committee deliberated, discussed, clarified and agreed on the following:

**Committee Charge:**

1. Create a mission/vision for the ‘HEP’
2. Recommend a set of programs/services responsive to the mission.
3. Recommend which institutions would deliver programs & services
4. Recommend a new name for HEP
5. Address other issues that arise

**Progress Made to Date:**

1. A set of ground rules were created. (see appendix B).

2. Draft mission and vision statements have been created and accepted by group consensus:

**Mission:** HEP is a high quality, specialized, accessible, and collaborative educational and research resource responsive to Maine communities’ changing economic, social, and health needs.

**Vision:** To achieve its mission, HEP will focus academic resources in two complementary clusters of programs important to Maine—programs in allied health and programs that ensure academic access opportunities and student success support systems for first-time, transfer, and degree completion students in the Bangor region.

Access programs will provide flexible, integrated, educational opportunities for students of diverse backgrounds and experiences wishing to pursue higher education for the first time or complete a degree. These programs will build on academic partnerships ensuring alignment of programs and support services dedicated to student success.

Allied health programs will prepare individuals for professional careers in the health and human services dedicated to translating research to clinical practice, promoting wellness, and maximizing community outreach. These programs will enhance working
relationships between the campus and the region’s medical institutions and social and human service agencies.

Both program clusters will apply innovative educational methods, have a strong public service orientation, establish and sustain partnerships with business and community affiliates, and target economic development and career development opportunities.

3. A list of potential names for the Higher Education Park have been brainstormed and documented (see appendix C).

4. The committee began the process of identifying academic programs integration (see appendix D; appendix E; appendix F for illustrative examples of this discussion).

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Establish subcommittees of UMA/UCB and EMCC faculty and staff to review areas of potential synergy and integration in four broad categories - courses, programs, services and administration. Regardless of the outcomes of the Governor’s Task Force, we recommend that these collaborative discussions continue.

2. Examine potential synergy and integration of programs and services of the emerging entity with UMaine’s programs and services regardless of the outcomes from the Governor’s Task Force.

3. Provide services to students in a single point of access regardless of program of study or college affiliation.

4. Enhance the information technology infrastructure to permit universal access.

5. Define program ownership and preserve accreditations.

III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP

The committee spent time discussing what, if any, overlap occurred with other strategic directions of the UMS Strategic Plan. What follows is a reiteration of strategic directions #1-#9, bulleted excerpts from the Strategic Plan and comments from the committee.
SD #1. Strive for quality across the System through rigorous academic program planning, strengthened student services, and program realignment.

- Collaborate with the Maine Community College System (MCCS) to create a seamless transfer of most UMS-offered associate degree programs
- Co-locate university and community college resources in Bangor and Augusta

Committee Comments

There is considerable overlap with SD#1 in the areas of collaboration with EMCC, seamless transfer agreements, 2+2 programs, student services, and support.

SD #2. Build and sustain a high-quality and well-supported faculty and staff Systemwide.

Committee Comments

We were directed not to engage in conversations about faculty and staff issues, therefore, no conclusions were drawn about overlap with this particular strategic direction.

SD #3. Improve and expand the System’s Distance Education infrastructure and academic programs.

- Increase collaboration with Maine’s community colleges on the operation and academic program offerings of distance learning centers and sites

Committee Comments:

There is overlap with SD #3, as the HEP will continue to be both a send and receive site for distance education. As the role of UMA/UCB becomes clarified there may be a greater or lesser overlap of distance education offerings.
SD #4. Expand and enhance the System’s library resources in ways that benefit the research and resource needs of both its universities and the public.

Committee Comments:

There may be some overlap with SD#4. The HEP will offer cutting edge programs designed in response to community and state needs that may require specialized library resources.

SD #5. Strengthen and expand university-based research activity and capacity to enhance Maine’s economy.

Committee Comment:

There may be some overlap with SD#5 regarding research components proposed for the HEP.

SD #6. Establish institutional and individual performance measures to ensure prudent stewardship and public accountability.

Committee Comment:

At this point in time, there can be no direct overlap identified.

SD #7. Consolidate certain business and administrative functions across the System to achieve cost-savings and increased efficiencies while maintaining “front-line” customer services at the individual university level.

- Coordinate certain business aspects of admissions, student financial aid, bursar, and loan collections processing
- Improve coordination of human resources management

Committee Comment:

There will be overlap with SD 7, especially in the area of student services. We will find commonalities between separate institutions and consider efficiencies as we move forward.
SD #9. Develop a coordinated and collaborative approach to university advancement and advocacy to improve the appeal, reputation, financial resources, identity, and constituent support for Maine’s public universities.

Committee Comment:

There will be overlap with SD#9 as the HEP will be offering non-traditional educational programs that will require innovative marketing techniques.
IV. GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

With the establishment of the Governor’s Task Force, further work of this committee has been suspended; this committee is awaiting further clarification as to next steps. However, if we were to continue on in our work we would put forth the following set of recommendations:

We would recommend the following subcommittees be established in order to further explore and refine the areas initially identified by this committee. Subcommittees comprised of informed faculty and staff in the subject areas would be named and would be asked to explore and report back to the overall committee. The list of subcommittees would include: 1) Academic Programs, 2) Human Resources, 3) Student Support, 4) Administration and Facilities, 5) Transition Strategies, 6) Distance Education, 7) Off-campus Centers and 8) Governance.

*Detailed appendices of the Committee’s work are available upon request.*
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 – OUTREACH CENTERS AND SITES:

First Report
June 5, 2005

**Strategic Direction 8** - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

I. OVERVIEW

The Strategic Direction #8 – Outreach Centers Implementation Committee consisting of faculty, staff, students and administrators, first met on February 23, 2005 to receive the charge and to discuss the process and content with the Chair, Vice Chancellor Nunez. Subsequent to that initial meeting the committee met on March 25, April 1, April 26 and May 16, 2005 to hear and discuss presentations on: the Current State of the Centers, Technology, University of Maine at Machias and the Centers (a case study) and Centralization. The committee discussed concerns and recommendations in light of the committee charge and the parameters embedded in the UMS Strategic Plan:

“Simplify and rationalize the System and free up resources”

“Enhance Students’ educational experience”

“Build on strengths”

“Utilize resources most effectively and efficiently”

“Create a sustainable financial paradigm”

“Enhance revenue generation”

“Clarify decision-making parameters”

“Link planning and budgeting”

Throughout the course of its work, the Strategic Direction 8 – Outreach Centers Committee identified several areas of concern that need further examination and resolution as the process goes forward. In some cases, sub-committees will be appointed to address these concerns. Areas of concern include:
Access vs. Cost
Concerns regarding access vs. cost – and how this relates to quality – were discussed at length during our meetings. The question of how much access is adequate, and at what cost – both within the UMS and for all of higher education in Maine – was a recurring theme and will need further study. One of the questions that should be considered is the extent to which each of the Centers meets the needs originally covered by the University College Centers, since the educational landscape in Maine has changed since they were created. Related to this discussion were concerns about State funding for the University System, which has declined over the last several years and is not expected to increase in the near future. At the same time, the cost of higher education has been on the rise. Therefore, the committee is concerned about the costs of sustaining and improving the offerings of the Outreach Centers during a time of declining funding.

Competition and Collaboration
Currently, the State is experiencing a downturn in the number of traditional college-age students living in Maine, creating greater competition for fewer students between the University System, the Maine Community College System, and out-of-state institutions. However, this presents an important opportunity for the Outreach Centers and Sites to collaborate with Adult Education and the Community Colleges in order to better serve the State’s adult learners. We believe this opportunity warrants further study.

Structure
While the Strategic Plan calls for aligning the Centers with individual Universities, the Committee believes that technology should remain centralized and student support services, in light of Project Enterprise and THESIS, may need centralization in some areas. More time is needed, however, to study the issue of campus oversight of Centers and Sites.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Collaboration

**Major Recommendations:**

- Build collaborative relationships with K-12, Adult Education, and the Community Colleges to share resources and sites and to enhance college readiness, transferability, and student support services (i.e., advising)

- Collaborate with the State, K-12, Adult Education, and the Community Colleges on the use of technology, and explore opportunities to share technological resources
• Continue and increase communication among the Outreach Centers

• Enhance relationships between Outreach Centers and Universities in order to increase access to regionally based and State-wide programming

2. Academic Quality and Program Planning

Major Recommendations:

• Create a System-wide committee to conduct regional needs assessments with the Centers to determine appropriate course and program offerings in relationship to community needs, consistent with the goals of Strategic Directions 1, 3 and 6

• Offer an appropriate number and range of undergraduate and graduate degree programs, both at the State-wide and regional levels

• Provide a mechanism for State-wide coordination of degree offerings

• Modernize technology across the Outreach Centers to improve the quality of academic offerings

• Explore incentives for greater faculty involvement at the Centers and establish faculty development programs that focus on the specific needs of faculty at the Outreach Centers, consistent with the work of the Strategic Direction 2 Committee

• Include a plan for Distance Education that enhances learning through greater faculty and student engagement at the Outreach Centers, consistent with the recommendations of the Strategic Direction 3 Committee

3. Structure and Mission

Major Recommendations:

• Continue to enhance and support centralized technology utilized by the Outreach Centers and Sites

• Integrate the work of Strategic Direction 7 – THESIS and Project Enterprise to enhance the delivery of student support services at the Centers and Sites

• Create a mission statement for each Outreach Center that emphasizes access to State-wide and regionally based University programming and that is consistent with the University of Maine System mission
• Develop a standard rubric for assessing the efficiency and financial stability of the Outreach Centers and Sites in the context of access versus cost, while continuing to offer broad access to education for Maine’s place-bound learners

• Continue to study the advantages and disadvantages of aligning the Outreach Centers with appropriate Universities, as well as areas for System-wide centralization

4. Accountability and Financial Stability

Major Recommendations

• Develop accountability measures for the Outreach Centers and Sites, consistent with the System-wide accountability recommendations of the Strategic Direction 6 Committee

• Link planning and budgeting to community needs and performance measures

• Create new financial models for financing the Outreach Centers, based on best practices

• Promote entrepreneurship so that Centers can capitalize on their market niche and increase revenue

• Enhance marketing, recruitment, and retention campaigns for Centers in order to increase their enrollments and advance their reputations

III. AREAS OF OVERLAP

Strategic Direction #8 overlaps with the following Strategic Directions:

• **Strategic Direction #1**: Rigorous academic program planning, program realignment and strengthened student services...
  o Ensure accessible opportunities for students at a distance who wish to go on from associate to baccalaureate degree programs
  o Explore opportunities for collaboration with the MCCS
  o Strengthen programs and services, especially for non-traditional students at Outreach Centers and Sites
  o Offer access to graduate offerings through the Outreach Centers and Sites, where appropriate.
- **Strategic Direction #2**: High-quality, well-supported faculty; strong faculty development programs
  - Identify faculty concerns related to teaching at the Outreach Centers and/or via technology, and create development opportunities and incentives to encourage and enhance teaching, both face-to-face and via technology, at Outreach locations

- **Strategic Direction #3**: Create a comprehensive, state-of-the-art System-wide Distance Education program...
  - Increase the number of degree programs available at a distance
  - Improve services for students learning at a distance.

- **Strategic Direction #6**: Require accountability from all universities...establish goals, objectives and performance measures...
  - Design fiscal accountability metrics for Centers and Sites.
  - Develop performance measures for the Centers and Sites
  - Explore opportunities for co-locations with the Community Colleges

- **Strategic Directions #7**: Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate...
  - Communicate with representatives of the THESIS project to make sure that the needs of multi-campus and distance students are met.

**IV. NEXT STEPS**

The Committee will circulate this report over the summer and begin discussions of these preliminary recommendations leading up to the Implementation Planning retreat on September 16. The Committee will ask interested parties to come together to explore further the recommendations made in the broad categories: collaboration; accountability and financial stability; academic quality and program planning; simplify and rationalize outreach centers. Any further study or subcommittee findings will be incorporated in the second interim report due in November 2005.

*Detailed appendices of the Committee’s work are available upon request.*
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 – THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE:

First Report

June 5, 2005

Strategic Direction 8 - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

I. OVERVIEW

II.
Strategic Direction #8 was defined in the UMS Plan as: Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

Components of the plan include paying careful attention to: (1) Simplifying/ rationalizing the System and freeing up resources; (2) Enhancing students’ educational experience; (3) Build on strengths; (4) Utilize resources most effectively and efficiently; (4) Create a sustainable financial paradigm; (5) Enhance revenue generation; (6) Clarify decision-making parameters; and, (7) Link planning and budgeting.

In order to achieve this goal, the University established a number of university wide committees (an overall Strategic Planning Committee, a Higher Education Park Committee, a Distance Education/Outreach Centers Committee, a Committee on Fogler Library, and a Graduate Research Education Committee) to align University planning and actions with a number of strategic directions and with the overall strategic plan. The general charge(s) for all of these committees and the specific charge(s) for each committee is shown in Appendix A. Appendix B lists the membership of each committees and an enhanced focus for efforts. In addition to forming new, strategic planning committees, the University of Maine charged several existing committees (see Appendix C, University Research Council) with tasks associated with this strategic direction. These committees have been meeting on their own self-determined schedules. The remainder of this interim report addresses specific progress to date.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS
(1) The Coalition on the Graduate Environment has prepared a very thorough draft document entitled “Graduate Research, Scholarship and Education at the University of Maine: Meeting the Challenges of the University of Maine System Strategic Plan” (see Appendix D). The strategic planning committees will consider this report in more detail in the coming months.

(2) The University Research Council has prepared a thoughtful draft document on a strategic plan for research and development that will be further considered by the faculty and the strategic planning committees next fall.

(3) The faculty of the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture has prepared a proposal to create a School of Forestry by merging and strengthening several existing programs and efforts (see Appendix F); this proposal has been shared with the UMS chief academic officers;

(4) Vice President Janet Waldron has strengthened communication with the Faculty Senate Finance Committee on issues surrounding the University budget that has resulted in improved awareness of fiscal challenges and suggestions for cost savings and enhanced revenues;

(5) Discussions continue with the faculty regarding a possible College of Allied Health Professions;

(6) Substantial efforts have been undertaken to establish a Graduate School of Bio-Medical Sciences with the involvement of partner institutions throughout the state;

(7) A System wide initiative on tourism (the Center for Tourism Research—CENTRO) has been proposed, approved, and is in the process of being implemented.

(8) A national initiative on sports education—Sports Done Right—has been initiated and has been extraordinarily well received, both statewide and nationally. This initiative was lead by the College of Education and Human Development;

(9) The University has established a competitive fund to reward academic improvement initiatives. This fund, called MAPI (Maine Academic Prominence Initiative) is focused on improvement in academic programs that are not eligible for state or federal funds, such as the Maine Economic Improvement Fund. We have granted six (6) MAPI awards this year.

III. NEXT STEPS
The University will continue to refine our strategic plan and make progress on the issues and topics addressed in this interim report.

*Detailed appendices of the Committee’s work are available upon request.*
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 – USM / UMA INTEGRATION:
First Report
June 5, 2005

| Strategic Direction 8 - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future. |

I. OVERVIEW

The UMS BOT voted to adopt the UMS Strategic Plan on September 20, 2004. Shortly thereafter, President’s Pattenaude and Lyons were charged with designing a process for implementation planning to begin the integration of USM with UMA. Strategic Direction #8 states that we are to: “Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the mission, niches, and interrelationships of the institutions to ensure that the system serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.”

The goals as outlined in the Strategic Plan were to:

- Simplify and rationalize the system and free up resources.
- Enhance students’ educational experience
- Build on strengths
- Utilize resources most effectively and efficiently
- Create a sustainable financial paradigm
- Enhance revenue generation
- Clarify decision-making parameters
- Link planning and budgeting

A timeline was developed and presented which stated preliminary recommendations were to be submitted to the Chancellor by June of 2005. (see Appendix A.)
II PROGRESS MADE TO DATE/CHRONOLOGY

Presidents Lyons and Pattenaude along with key staff from both UMA and USM began meeting to determine next steps. Two principles have helped guide our planning process:

1. We will proceed carefully, in a collaborative fashion, honoring and respecting the work of all faculty and staff.

2. We will keep the best interests of students and the community at the center of all discussions.

Planning for implementation was organized in two phases. Phase I, which spanned the period from October 2004 to mid-March 2005, focused on exploration and analysis (see Appendix B). During this period, our activities included:

- The creation of UMA and USM liaison teams of faculty, staff and students. These liaison teams networked for several months, hosting meetings at their respective campuses. Liaison teams retreat resulted in blended progress reports. The student groups created a shared governance document that received the approval of both the Chancellor and Presidents. (see Appendix C).

- UMA/USM faculty designed their own process which included a facilitated retreat resulting in a document summarizing outcomes of their time together.

- Sandra Featherman, President of UNE provided information on the UNE/Biddeford merger.

- UMA/USM senior staffs began meeting to discuss the challenges and opportunities regarding the integration; common listserv for these senior staffs was created for ease of discussion on several issues.

- Campus-wide discussion forums were planned for UMA. Several meetings were held to decide locale, presentation and discussion questions.

- Planning for a Joint UMA/USM Board of Visitors ensued. A planning committee comprised of four members of each board worked to create an agenda for a joint meeting. This meeting was to begin the integration of the two boards into one organization.

- Creation of a UMA/USM integration communication plan and website was designed and provided a vehicle for communication to those interested in finding out information about the integration timeline/process. The Admissions Q & A document is one such piece that was posted to the website (see Appendix D).
• Presidents Lyons and Pattenaude held open-campus Q & A sessions on both campuses and with some community groups.

III. SUMMARY OF PHASE I. ISSUES

Opportunities: Emergent themes

► UMA/USM found much in common (e.g., student body)
► Increased collaboration could strengthen each institution (e.g., UMA could provide expertise in technology, USM could provide access to additional curricular options)

Challenges: Emergent themes

► UMA loss of autonomy/identity.
► Institutional compatibility
► Faculty/staff integration
► Transferability issues
► Consistent level of student services
► Change in fee structures

IV. CURRENT STATUS & GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

In March, 2005 coinciding with the end of Phase I, the Chancellor asked Presidents Lyons and Pattenaude to suspend work on this initiative pending further discussions with the legislature and the community. Subsequent to that and with the establishment of the Governor’s Task Force to Plan for Higher Education in Kennebec Valley, further work on SD #8 – UMA/USM Integration has been suspended in order to await the outcome of the Governor’s Task Force completion date December, 2005.

Detailed appendices of the Committee’s work are available upon request.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 – MAINE STATE CONSORTIUM:
First Report
June 5, 2005

Strategic Direction 8 - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

I. OVERVIEW
Since the System Plan was adopted in September 2004, the presidents of the University of Maine at Fort Kent, the University of Maine at Machias, and the University of Maine at Presque Isle have been meeting together monthly and working closely with Chancellor Westphal and the System Staff to develop the concept of a consortium among these three distinct institutions. Our approach has not been to create a separate group of “implementation committees,” but to introduce the concept and the values of collaboration and cooperation through existing offices and structures.

We proceeded in an orderly fashion beginning with campus vice presidents (two at Machias and Fort Kent, and three at Presque Isle) and then worked our way through the campus organization. As soon as the plan had been presented by the Chancellor to the Maine Legislature, we initiated the meetings with the vice presidents individually on each campus and then worked with directors and other administrators while the Chief Academic Officers proceeded to meet with their counterparts on the other campuses. From those meetings evolved identification of selected academic programs to begin meeting. At all levels and across all offices, productive interactions among the three institutions are taking place.

Details of what has been accomplished to far are provided in Section II. In virtually every case, inter-campus meetings have generated positive and exciting ideas for cooperation that will benefit our students. These culminated in a two-day session involving 45 campus leaders described in Section IV of this report.

II. PROGRESS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The three Campus Presidents meet monthly. In December, we visited each of the three campuses to review facilities, programs and needs. We routinely share information including capital needs, financial statements, strategic plans, accreditation reviews and self-studies.
- Chief Academic Officers meet monthly and have identified academic programs that are signature programs for single campuses, those that should be offered on all three such as education, and those that may be
offered on two or more campuses where we can demonstrate sufficient specialties within the major.

- Chief Academic Officers have initiated meetings with members of their own faculty units and created a timetable for faculty in certain programs to begin meetings with their counterparts. Faculty encouraged to begin meeting include: Business, History, English, Education, Criminal Justice/Rural Public Safety Administration, Recreation Management, and Environmental Studies. Three of these program meetings have already occurred. Education Faculty will address how to create a graduate program for the teachers in our region.

- Chief Academic Officers and faculty leaders are examining the General Education Requirements at all three campuses with a view to creating a common set of requirements surrounding an inner core of six to nine credits that reflect the unique aspects of each campus.

- The three Chief Financial Officers meet routinely

- The presidents have reviewed lists of all University of Maine System Committees to insure representation as appropriate, to identify instances where one campus can represent all three members, and to set up protocol and procedures for reporting back to the presidents and for sharing information among all three institutions. This saves travel expense and reduces time-away for offices with small staffs.

- All three submitted planning grant proposals to the Melmac Foundation to consider retention studies and efforts as a consortium. All three were awarded $6,000 each by the Foundation to prepare a full blown proposal during the coming year, including a single Retention Expert.

- We generated a job description for a single Development Professional to serve all three institutions. The concept was approved by the Chancellor for funding for an initial three years. We have begun the search process. We are examining other areas where this model might be effective, such as Institutional Research and Grant Writing.

- The three institutions collaborate in a Maine Department of Education Grant Program to prepare Special Education Teachers for Aroostook and Washington Counties.

- We attended a presentation by the Massachusetts Higher Education Consortium, a group purchasing organization initiated in Massachusetts and approved to operate in other states. We will join individually or as a consortium and will use this organization for savings and to encourage vendors from our region to sell through the consortium.

- Chief Student Affairs Officers meet routinely. Out of their sessions, a solid core of recommendations has emerged including:
  1) Support for the purchase of One-Card Systems for the consortium institutions. This is a safety and security issue.
  2) Student Activities Coordinators will seek to block-book visiting performers at a savings to all three.
3) Working together will enable us to provide higher quality professional development speakers and opportunities at lower cost.  
4) The three campuses are reviewing each other’s policy manuals and propose to exchange Resident Assistants periodically in order to learn from each other.  
5) We will open up participation in each other’s study abroad agreements in order to expand options for our students.

- Presidents met in February with the three Public Relations Directors and encouraged them to work more closely. We envision joint purchasing of advertising space in markets we cannot afford on our own, cooperation and coordination wherever possible. They have been meeting routinely and have their own excellent list of ideas including, joint directories, joint press releases and joint underwriting of Maine’s High School Basketball Tournament.  
- Machias has been served very well by a partnership with the University of Maine Bookstore. We would like to extend that relationship to the three campuses.

III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP

This is a stand-alone change involving only the three institutions involved. Beyond structure, it is true that the change will enable us to expand opportunities for students, staff and faculty in very positive ways that will impact our ability to respond to all of the other dimensions of the Strategic Plan, but it would be cumbersome and probably unproductive to walk through all of these relationships and relate each to strategic directions in the plan. At this point, our experience suggests that the Consortium, while preserving our unique identities, is providing an important vehicle for us to collaborate in ways that benefit all three institutions.

IV. GOALS FOR NEXT STEPS

Goals for next year include ongoing efforts to incorporate the consortium model throughout all appropriate levels of the three institutions. We would hope to see specific outcomes from the many meetings that have begun at multiple levels throughout each institution. In terms of the academic divisions especially, we would hope to review projects and proposals from the six departments identified to begin meetings this spring; and we would hope to see very concrete steps taken toward initiating a graduate program in education through the consortium as early as summer of 2006.

On May 22nd-23rd, the Consortium Presidents with the financial support of the System Office hosted a two day Appreciative Inquiry Summit engaging forty five leaders from all levels of the three institutions. Suggested by Trustee Margaret Weston, and facilitated by a consulting team including Trustee Weston, the session focused on an exploration of our institutional identities and a discovery of ways in which the three could support each other and strengthen all three campuses. Participants included 14-15 leaders
from each campus in the areas of administration, faculty, classified and professional staff, students, alumni, and boards of Visitors. The session ended with strong support for follow up sessions in the fall to engage more people from each campus, and specific commitments by participants to work on one of nine specific projects developed during the two days including:

1. Joint Fine and Performing Arts Programs serving our campuses and communities.
2. Study of the demand for and ability to provide Graduate Programs through the consortium.
3. Follow up Communications to extend the messages from the two days throughout our institutions.
4. Creation of a Joint Student Association for interested students from all three campuses.
5. Cross-Fertilization of Academic Programs among the three institutions.
6. Consideration of a degree program in Business and Entrepreneurship through the Consortium.
7. Establishment of a web-based writing Center for Faculty.
8. Further discussion of General Education with a view to agreement on a common definition of an educated student.

This session provided an exciting and vital foundation for broadening the base of people and offices involved in the consortium effort as a tool to serve all three institutions. Bottom line, the consortium is well underway and we look forward to engaging with other institutions within the system, and with system staff and trustees as a strong entity that embraces three vibrant institutions.
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Strategic Direction 8 - Evolve the System organization and structure, clearly defining the missions, niches, and interrelationships of institutions to ensure that the System serves the higher education needs of the State of Maine while moving toward a financially sustainable future.

V. Overview

With the Strategic Plan commitment to support a single-campus, public liberal arts college in Farmington, the UMF faculty and administration have proceeded to develop plans to align the University’s curriculum with curricula at other Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges and at quality private liberal arts colleges. This endeavor, which involves moving from a three-credit per course standard to a four-credit standard, is focused on re-thinking student learning outcomes in every academic program. It is being designed to increase the level of academic rigor (both in courses and across academic programs). Faculty will challenge students with more reading, writing, research, collaborative projects, community-based applications of classroom learning, etc. Assessment systems will be built to insure accountability. The new curriculum will reduce the fragmentation that both faculty and students experience and will allow both groups to invest more of themselves in each class. It is intended to increase time on task and to stimulate exciting innovations in teaching and learning. In addition, because four credits will deepen the relationships between faculty and students, including more class time, more collaborative research, more feedback on complex assignments, etc., we are hopeful that it will lead to higher retention and graduation rates.

This initiative will also enhance UMF’s institutional distinctiveness (within the UMS) and will provide an enhanced opportunity for the System to serve Maine students who seek a liberal arts college experience but cannot afford private college prices. At the same time, articulation agreements will be reviewed and transfer equivalencies re-evaluated to insure that transferability is not impeded. We anticipate few difficulties, as UMF already handles transfer situations to and from four-credit institutions, as we do to and from institutions with quarter instead of semester systems.

VI. Preliminary Recommendations
Early in the spring semester, the faculty at UMF voted (83% in favor; majority support in nine of ten academic departments) to adopt the four-credit model and to embark on a total curriculum redesign, provided that the UMS and UMF were able to secure the funds identified as needed for the project in a campus-wide feasibility study. This feasibility study was based on preliminary curriculum outlines developed by every academic program, transition agreements related to general education, guidelines for the size of majors, suggestions related to strategies for increasing academic standards and intellectual rigor, and new faculty policies about class meeting time.

The feasibility study identified needs for 9-10 new faculty positions. These are primarily in areas where there are only two faculty in an academic program. They will insure that the program is able to continue to offer an adequate breadth of courses. In addition, investments will be made in mathematics and education, the former to support increased math requirements in general education and for education majors, the latter to support the development of a junior-year practicum and to insure that the overall reduction in course offerings does not interfere with UMF’s ongoing commitment to provide professional development for teachers and access to baccalaureate programs in Early Childhood Education for in-service teachers across the state who must now attain this higher credential.

VII. Areas of Overlap

The main areas of overlap are in the following areas:

Strategic Direction #1: Development of stronger program review processes (UMF itself recently implemented its own strengthened guidelines); collaboration with the Maine Community College System to create seamless transfer from associate degree programs.

Strategic Direction #2: Establishment of improved faculty development programs; enhancement of teaching technology in classrooms.

Strategic Direction #4: Development of library resources appropriate to support UMF’s mission and its interest in increasing opportunities and expectations related to undergraduate research.

Strategic Direction #6: Performance-based funding; development of clear goals and objectives for institutional management.

This is not necessarily an exhaustive list. Administrative leadership at UMF, in collaboration with System leadership, will pay close attention to the evolution of strategic plan implementation in order to identify other possible areas of overlap.
VIII. Goals for Next Steps

Following a presentation of these plans to the Board of Trustees on April 15 and with indications of support from the Chancellor and his senior staff, the UMF administration issued a Request for Proposals from academic programs to support summer work on curriculum redesign. Awards have been made, and the work has begun. Every academic program this summer will be developing a comprehensive report that includes:

1) A list of current three-credit courses that will continue to exist in a revised four-credit form, with information about revised course titles and course descriptions.
2) A list of all new courses, with course descriptions.
3) A list of new program requirements, for both majors and minors, and concentrations.
4) A course cycling and staffing plan: when courses will be taught, numbers of sections envisioned, and who will teach them. (This will include assumptions about major enrollment and student demand due to program requirements and general education requirements. Course cycling plans will be designed to accommodate student graduation in four years.)
5) Information about the coordination and communication that has taken place with other programs that may be affected by curriculum changes.
6) A vision statement regarding how four credits will affect student learning outcomes. Faculty have been asked: How will your students be better prepared for their lives after college? What will higher academic standards and increased rigor mean in your program? (These statements will then be connected to the development of new assessment plans in each program)
7) Job descriptions for new tenure-track faculty lines, in instances where a demonstrated need has already been shown and the administration has approved new positions.

With a four-credit curriculum in place, UMF will also explore:

- Opportunities to create a general education program that is distinctive, coherent, and developmental (the equivalent of a second major for every student).
- Extension of our EXCEL program to support ubiquitous laptop computing.
- A plateau tuition system (wherein full-time students purchase a full, residential college experience, not seat time by the credit hour).
- A four-year graduation guarantee for students who declare a major by the end of their first year, regularly meet with an academic advisor, stay in school full-time, and meet minimum academic standards.
- The expansion of existing Centers and Institutes and the creation, where appropriate, of new Centers and Institutes to deepen the experiences of
students, draw new resources to UMF, and improve our ability to recruit highly qualified faculty.

- Options to enhance the Board of Visitors so that UMF’s statewide mission and statewide distinctiveness are matched with statewide supporters and persons of influence who are committed to the vision of high quality, residential, liberal education in the public sector.
- Innovative strategies to market the university (including an appropriate name change).
- Creative strategies to increase fundraising by capitalizing on genuine mission and product differentiation.
- Investments in faculty and staff salaries and in Student Life by taking advantage of new revenue streams and operational savings.
- Opportunities to seek necessary funds to improve the appearance of the campus so that aesthetically we are competitive with other residential, four-year colleges.
I. OVERVIEW
Consistent with the goals set out for this direction in the Strategic Plan, the steering committee created three sub committees to address: 1. Communications and Advocacy, 2. Marketing and Recruitment, and 3. Development. The Steering Committee met twice, February 23, and again on March 22 to outline the objectives to be addressed and to organize the subcommittees. At the March meeting it was determined to hold a full day session with all members of the committee May 19th. That session took place in Belfast at the Hutchinson Center. It was an extremely productive session. By breaking out into the three subcommittees for most of the session we were able to move off of generalities and get down to specifics.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. COMMUNICATIONS AND ADVOCACY

1. Assess what resources will be available to develop a comprehensive state-wide (and beyond) communications and advocacy program. What resources do we have to work with? Investigate more fully what other states do.
2. Ultimately 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.
3. 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.

B. MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT

1. Update the central website to provide a complete inventory of institutions and academic programs available. Generate attractive printed materials with this same information.
2. 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.

3. 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.

C. DEVELOPMENT

1. Provide the support needed to upgrade the current donor data base management system to a usable system. We simply cannot operate as effective fund raisers or stewards of the gifts we have with the Benefactor System in place.

2. Create a campaign for Maine’s Public Universities targeted to corporations and foundations that may operate in state but have headquarters elsewhere. Outline what the campaign would be for, and how the funds would be allocated. Identify prospects and best persons to make the ask.

3. 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.

4. Support ongoing campus efforts:
   - Insure that the central website is up to date and effective for donors. Make it easy to give.
   - Market the existing Charitable Gift Annuity Program more aggressively and more routinely.
   - Facilitate professional development for fund raising personnel. Host regular meetings of Advancement Leaders; look for opportunities for mutual support.

III. KEY AREAS OF OVERLAP

This committee will have extensive overlap with all of the other elements of the System Strategic Plan. Indeed, in many ways the work of the other eight committees establishes the agenda for Strategic Direction Nine. The interfaces will occur at each of the three sub areas; specifically
1. **Communications and Advocacy.** As the various committees reconfigure the future of the System and our Campuses, this committee will be charged to recommend ways to best communicate that future both internally to our institutions and employees, and externally to the public. As the committees bring together people from all of our campuses, all are discovering many things done on some campuses that others did not know about or appreciate. We need to highlight our own best practices and focus our efforts toward a stronger overall group of institutions.

2. **Marketing and Recruitment.** In addition to simply informing people of the proposals developing out of the Strategic Plan, we need to convert those pieces of information into a coherent and compelling marketing message that will enhance the recruiting efforts of all of our institutions. All of the activities that will improve academic quality and raise the professional development and research opportunities for our faculty need to be folded into strategic messages that will attract both students and prospective faculty and staff to elements of the University of Maine System. All campuses and service centers should benefit from well stated, factual messages that highlight the opportunities and excellence that exists and will be enhanced within the Maine System.

3. **Development.** Finally, this same information needs to be converted into effective case statements that will encourage investment in the University System by private donors and legislators alike. It will be the work of this committee to take the messages and the future the various committees propose and convert them into a compelling case for support. This committee will work with the Chancellor’s Office to create a business plan that will outline all of these needs and propose potential funding sources to achieve our objectives.

### IV. LONGER TERM GOALS

#### A. COMMUNICATIONS AND ADVOCACY

1. Build a sense of public “Ownership” of Maine’s Public Universities.
2. Promote the quality aspects emerging through the System Plan.
3. Support ongoing funding for central communications efforts.
4. Promote/support electronic communications with our graduates.
5. Work with employers. Help them to understand the important role their public universities play in educating their workforce.

#### B. MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT

1. Continue “Value” and “Quality” Campaigns.
2. Generate a multi Media (including broadcast) Public Awareness Campaign in and out of Maine.
3. Conduct Market Research to verify where we are and where we want to be every two years.
4. Completely redesign the central website and create a vehicle to draw people to it.
5. Profile the outstanding faculty at Maine’s Public Universities.
6. Explore other media such as signage on trucks, buses, and public transportation.

C. DEVELOPMENT

1. Create and host a senior level Development Advisory Council to:
   • Identify national foundations and corporations for system approach.
   • Discuss donor relations with major corporations statewide.
   • Explore opportunities for collaboration and cooperation as well as mutual support and cost sharing, for example use University of Maine Alumni Call Center to train Phonathon personnel for all campuses, and share conference/meeting spaces in other cities.

2. Develop relationships, cultivation activities and asks from national corporations using presidents, chancellor, governor, legislators, and trustees taking care to avoid any existing campus relationships.