SD#1 Executive Summary.

Strategic Direction # 1 focuses on student success and has eight interrelated recommendations to encourage and support student success. All relate to recruiting and retaining well prepared students: 1) align with K-12 student preparation, or college readiness; 2) implement degree program review based on student outcomes; 3) develop a shared set of general education objectives; 4) expand collaborative efforts for degree program and course delivery; 5) inventory and assess associate degree programs; 6) elaborate articulation and two-plus-two programs for transfer students; 7) advocate for and implement expanded financial aid to ensure access; and 8) develop a set of outcomes-oriented measures of success. Recommendations generally require existing System and institutional leadership resources and attention to appropriate shared governance for successful implementation, or, said another way, they require more in commitment to achievement in a reasonable and measurable time line than an infusion of new dollars. The significant exception is financial aid, which could be quite costly, but which has the potential to make all of the other recommendations work effectively toward increased student success across the University of Maine System.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Build effective K-12 and Maine Community College System—University of Maine System Alignment and Collaboration Strategies.</td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Build effective program review focused on student success outcomes</td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>BOT, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Presidents, CAOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Develop a shared set of general education objectives built on a process of consensus.</td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>CAOs, Faculty Senates</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures</td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>CAOs, Faculty Senates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Strategic Direction - 1**

**ACADEMIC QUALITY**

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

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Human Resource Requirement</th>
<th>Financial Cost</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Complexity of Implementation</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee numbers, levels, expertise and time commitment required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Amount of money required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Length of time required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Level and complexity of bureaucracy required to implement recommendation</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible to lead implementation of recommendation</td>
<td>Rank in order of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Low - Little employee investment (1-10 employees)</td>
<td>Low - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Low - 2007</td>
<td>Low - Staff empowered to make decisions</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - Moderate employee investment (10-25 employees)</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - Significant employee investment (More than 25 employees)</td>
<td>High - $ 1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Medium - Less than $250,000</td>
<td>Medium - 2007</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Build strong articulation programs for transfer students, including two-plus-two programs</td>
<td>Medium - $250,000 to $1 million</td>
<td>Medium - 2008-2011</td>
<td>Medium - Chancellor and multi-campus administration involvement</td>
<td>CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium - $ 1 million and above</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - 2012 and later</td>
<td>High - Legislature, Board, Chancellor and Presidential involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High - BOT, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Presidents, CSAOs</td>
<td>BOT, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Presidents, CSAOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop accountability measures demonstrating student success with respect to Recommendations 1-7 within the context of the various institutional missions of UMS institutions</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Chancellor, Presidents, CAOs, CSAOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SD#1 Investment Budget Analysis.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


Performance Metric Questions

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

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

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

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

► Has the proportion of admitted students meeting recommendations for college success increased?
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1.2 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

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

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

Performance Metric Questions

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

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

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

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

Performance Metric Questions

- Have CAOs developed in consultation with their respective Faculty Senates a set of shared general education outcomes?
- Has each institution implemented the set of shared general education outcomes?
- Has each institution reviewed the effectiveness of its general education relative to the set of shared general education outcomes relative to student success?

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

- Has the number of students taking and completing collaborative programs and courses increased?
- Does the System inventory collaborative program and course delivery structures?
- Do program proposal and review processes address design for collaborative delivery of programs and courses?
- Are mechanisms in place to encourage and support faculty collaboration for developing program and course delivery structures among multiple institutions.

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

1.4. Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures.
Strategic Direction 1
Academic Quality
1.5 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

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

Performance Metric Questions

- Has each institution inventoried and determined the regional need for continuing associate degree programs in collaboration with appropriate community colleges?
- Has each institution developed a plan for suspension and elimination of associate degree programs, continuation of existing programs, or development of new programs, consistent with demonstrated regional need?
- Has the BOT approved institutional plans for meeting regional needs for associate degree programs?
1.6 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Strategic Direction 1

Academic Quality

1.6 ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Recommendation

Performance Metric Questions

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

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

► Have institutions removed any non-academically necessary impediments to smooth articulation for transfer students?

► Has the number of transfer students increased consistent with program planning and institutional missions?

► Have institutions developed two-plus-two degree programs consistent with an inventory of regional needs and responsive to articulation requirements?
1.7. Provide effective Financial Aid programs to support student success.

**Performance Metric Questions**

- Has the System been able to increase the amount of financial aid dollars available across the System and from all sources and for both need and merit?

- Have financial aid allocation strategies led to an increase and increased retention in the number of eligible students enrolled in each institution?

- Have financial aid strategies led to an increase in net tuition revenue at each institution?
Performace Metric Questions

1. Are post-graduation surveys in place and operational to assess the quality and effectiveness of institutional programs?

2. Are performance measures in place and operational for Strategic Direction # 1 recommendations 1.1 through 1.7, as demonstrated by a sample audit across all recommendations and all System institutions?

3. Are Strategic Direction # 1 recommendations deemed consistent with Strategic Direction # 6 recommendations on accountability and consistent with approved core values, when BOT approves Strategic Direction # 6 recommendations?
SD#1 Summary Comments.

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