Executive Summary: Strategic Direction #1 focuses on student success and has eight recommendations: 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 are low in cost, requiring more in commitment to achievement in a reasonable and measurable timeline 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.

A. The Second Report—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 was to develop recommendations regarding systematic 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, the UMS enhances their ability to attain the goal.

The Committee’s goal, and the focus of its recommendations, is to work to enhance opportunities for student success through System and institution actions from recruitment to graduation. Its objectives are measurable expectations of achievement, in other words that students will come prepared to succeed, universities will provide academic and financial support programs for success, and students will progress and graduate at a reasonable pace. At the same time, institutions will be responsible for specific and measurable outcomes—they will ensure that students develop specific knowledge, skills, or developmental attributes. The Committee’s recommendations provide the appropriate and necessary foundational work to attain the goal, objectives, and outcomes of Strategic Direction #1.
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 by PolyCom several times over the 2005 Fall Semester to discuss the response to its Preliminary Report (May 2005) and formulated a set of recommendations to present to the Board of Trustees in January, 2006. Each recommendation had one or more champions to compile information and draft text, which the Committee Coordinating Chair edited into a single document. Between meetings Committee members interacted as necessary to provide information, ideas, and feedback. Not all members could participate in every facet of the work, but all were given an opportunity at least to comment on meeting agendas, notes, and drafts of the report. Each institution in the System had at least one representative fully engaged in the process of developing recommendations. As with the preliminary report, 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.

Efforts at effective communication with other Strategic Directions were mixed at best. Strategic Direction # 4 Committee provided specific language on libraries for use in this report—it is abridged below. The Committee heard a report from Jim Breece about the preliminary work of Strategic Direction # 6. Several members of this Committee served on other Committees, specifically Strategic Direction # 3 (also incorporating Strategic Direction # 8 on University Centers). We expect that integrative work between the Strategic Direction Committee reports will be an important aspect of work in Spring Semester 2006. In particular, Strategic Direction # 2 should encourage faculty development critical to success of recommendations here, and the Committee looks to Strategic Direction # 6 for guidance on core values and accountability.

Each of the Committee’s recommendations will require some appropriate endorsement and approval of academic policy modifications to implement actions through appropriate shared governance processes involving faculty senates, chief academic officers, and the Board of Trustees, and this process affects time lines.

The actions required for implementation of most of Strategic Direction # 1’s recommendations will not be expensive. They will take a commitment of time and effort on the part of institutional faculties and staff members. Some recommendations will take less time to accomplish, others more. Some will require continued attention over extended time. Most important, Committee members believe it imperative that the University of Maine System and its constituent institutions engage in continued close collaboration with the State K-12 educational institutions and the Maine Community College System for effective implementation of Strategic Direction # 1 at institutional, regional, and State-wide levels for all recommendations below.

Finally, the Committee’s work and its recommendations were fully informed by its discussion in Spring Semester 2005 on the nature of UMS students as reported in its Preliminary Report (May 2005). Because of the significance of that discussion to the
substance of its recommendations in this report, the Committee has attached the substantive parts of the Preliminary Report in Appendix A.

B. The Strategic Direction # 1 Recommendations. Following are eight recommendations with specific actions to be carried out for implementation as well as reference to appendices containing principles and necessary elaboration or context integral to successful implementation of the Strategic Direction. Although instructions required the Committee to address budget issues and time lines in a separate section of the Second Report, the Committee has chosen to address those by recommendation in a paragraph titled Discussion.

**SD#1 Recommendation 1. Build effective K-12 and Maine Community College System—University of Maine System Alignment and Collaboration Strategies.** Students can enhance their potential for success if they come to higher education adequately prepared for the challenges they will face. UMS must work effectively with the State’s K-12 Education System and the MCCS to align student preparation with UMS expectations, regardless of the point at which a student enters the UMS. Appendix B.1 provides specific principles for implementation as well as suggested language for elaboration or communication of the actions below.

**Actions:**

1.1.1. Improve Maine high school students’ college readiness and ease transition to college by establishing consistent, easy-to-understand college readiness guidelines; and effectively communicate these guidelines to Maine high schools, community colleges, and adult education programs.

1.1.2. Collaborate with MCCS and high schools to extend quality placement testing to Maine high school and adult education students, and support Maine high schools in creating curricula that address gaps in student knowledge and skills.

1.1.3. Launch System-wide assessment of effectiveness of developmental and 100-level courses. Examine retention issues, building on the work of institutional student services staff. Review periodically developmental courses in the same manner as academic degree programs.

1.1.4. Examine models for delivering college-level courses to high school students, and provide appropriate options to introduce at-risk and disaffected students as well as high achievers to higher education opportunities.

1.1.5. Seek appropriate endorsement and approval of academic policy modifications required to implement actions through shared governance processes involving, as appropriate, faculty senates, chief academic officers, and the Board of Trustees.
Discussion. Implementing this recommendation requires a high degree of purposeful collaboration and commitment on the part of all parties, and reluctance on the part of any party will easily undermine efforts of others. Financially, success with this recommendation could provide a significant benefit for UMS institutions by reducing the instructional resources needed for development work for students not ready for college. Such instructional resources could then be reallocated to program quality improvement.

**SD#1 Recommendation 2. Build effective program review focused on student success outcomes.** 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 program substance and must address mission and capacity of programs to respond to the nature of students. Programs must demonstrate balance between quality and access and work to ensure student success. Appendix B.2 provides suggested modification to the Board of Trustees Policy on Program Approval, Review, Suspension and Elimination (Section 305.1).

**Actions:**

1.2.1. Build effective program review policies that require program review within five years for new programs and at least every seven years for continuing programs, unless a shorter interval is required for specified conditions resulting from a review or for accreditation. Ensure institutions and the System fully review program review reports and provide responses and feedback to programs.

1.2.2. Develop a program review process that addresses explicitly student learning outcomes as the bases for program quality and educational value by assessing:

- Alignment of student learning objectives with the nature of students in the program and teaching effectiveness with respect to the student learning outcomes.

- Expectations for student preparation, access, engagement (such as defined by the National Survey of Student Engagement), and success.

- Faculty development and instructional improvement that take into account the nature and learning capacity of students and goals for faculty contributions to student learning.

- Student retention, progression, and graduation rates, including by tracking transfer students across the System and between the UMS and MCCS.

- A program’s contribution to general education, as appropriate, as well as general education’s contribution to the program.

- Relevance of library resources and information literacy as appropriate to the program.
Structures and mechanisms that blend academic affairs and student affairs in a constructive fashion.

Relevant institutional and community representation in academic program review and planning (for instance MCCS faculty and staff, or program alumni.).

Complementarity within and collaboration across the System, standards to be met, when and where programs are offered, and mechanisms to provide program access.

1.2.3. Seek appropriate faculty senate, chief academic officers, and Board of Trustees’ endorsement and approval for revision of UMS Board of Trustees program review policies (Section 305.1) to include Committee suggestions—see Appendix B.2.

Discussion. Effective program review need not be costly to undertake, unless procedures require significant involvement of extra-institutional review, as with accreditation visits, but agreement on objectives and assessment may take some time for effective faculty development. Implementation needs to be staggered over several years to adequately accommodate the large number of degree programs at some institutions.

SD#1 Recommendation 3. Develop a shared set of general education objectives built on a process of consensus. Shared general education objectives should highlight common general education themes, enhance transferability, and foster System-wide dialogue on expectations and assessment. Individual university missions will compel unique elaborations of this shared set of objectives. Objectives should be outcomes-based and lead to effective assessment measures. Appendix B.3 provides principles for developing shared objectives.

Actions:

1.3.1. Undertake a process of consensus to develop a common System-wide set of fundamental general education objectives upon which each institution can build and assess its own approach to general education.

1.3.2. Develop for general education an institution-based program review to assess effectiveness of general education as related to student learning outcomes. Align evaluation of student retention, progress, and graduation rates by institution to reflect the nature of students and their needs. Include reference to library resources and information literacy as appropriate to the program; structures and mechanisms that blend academic affairs and student affairs in a constructive fashion; and relevant institutional and community representation in the review (for instance MCCS faculty or alumni.).

1.3.3. 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., all of which contribute to success in general education.

1.3.4. Seek appropriate endorsement and approval of academic policy modifications required to implement actions through shared governance processes involving, as appropriate, faculty senates, chief academic officers, and the Board of Trustees.

Discussion. Inventory of existing objectives is a straightforward and easily accomplished process. Development of a set of shared general education objectives is a low cost endeavor that may take some concerted effort over a lengthy time period and involve both institutional and System consensus building to work effectively. In turn, developing of such a shared set of general education objectives may lead to institution-level, faculty-led revision of general education requiring new, and potentially costly, faculty development activities. Implementation of effective general education revision, however, may be funded by internal reallocation of instructional resources.

SD#1 Recommendation 4. Develop and support collaborative program and course delivery structures. The most effective use of System resources requires that higher education institutions maintain high standards, collaborate whenever possible, and design programs that take advantage of institutional complementarities in or for a service region. Cooperative delivery of educational courses and degree programs within UMS ensures continued offering of programs oriented to student success. Appendix B.4 provides examples of successful UMS collaborations and principles for developing new collaborations.

1.4.1. Evaluate regularly opportunities for collaboration in developing or extending program and course delivery systems.

1.4.2. Add a component to the Intent to Plan process that requires new program proposals to include recommendations for collaboration opportunities.

Discussion. Collaboration is a useful approach to avoiding significant and costly investment in a) low enrollment programs, such as foreign languages or doctoral degrees, and b) in limiting duplication of programs where such duplication could lead to redundant costs. Evaluation of need should be continuous. Collaborative development may require new resources. For principles to govern collaboration, see Appendix B.4.

SD#1 Recommendation 5. Address associate degree program needs in the state through collaboration with the Maine Community College System. The UMS Strategic Plan calls for elimination of associate degree programs as the MCCS develops its capacity to support such programs and meet student demand. Implementation requires systematic inventory and review of existing associate degree program needs by
institution. Continuation should be undertaken in accord with principles articulated in Appendix B.5.

**Actions:**

1.5.1. Inventory and assess associate degree programs at the institutional level and in collaboration with relevant MCCS institutions to determine joint capacity to support students and programs in accord with principles in Appendix B.5.

1.5.2. Develop and implement joint five-year and ten-year plans for institution-level support of associate degree programs with recommendations for developing and phasing out programs. Periodically review and modify the joint plans.

**Discussion.** Decisions on appropriate continuation of associate degree programs require analysis of regional demands in light of institutional capacities. Effective inventory and analysis of associate degree programs and joint UMS-MCCS plans for supporting programs should take no more than one semester and minimize UMS costs to maintain associate degree programs in the absence of offsetting enrollment revenues.

**SD#1 Recommendation 6.** Build strong articulation programs for transfer students, including two-plus-two programs. Each university must strengthen opportunities for students to transfer within UMS and from MCCS to UMS institutions, including through development of specific transfer articulation agreements and two-plus-two degree programs in accord with principles in Appendix B.6.

**Actions:**

1.6.1. Continue to develop specific articulation arrangements and two-plus-two programs that lead to accessible baccalaureate education and professional opportunities under the System-wide Articulation Agreement. Add a component to the Intent to Plan process that requires new program proposals include recommendations for articulation opportunities.

1.6.2. Develop and implement advising strategies and institutional practices that facilitate smooth transfer experiences.

**Discussion.** The primary concern here is to ensure appropriate review of pathways for students to transfer to UMS institutions as easily and successfully as possible. Review should be on-going. Costs of reviewing articulation should be minimal, and enrollment should fully fund costs associated with two-plus-two degree programs.

**SD#1 Recommendation 7.** Provide effective Financial Aid programs to support student success. For all of the efforts in Recommendations 1 to 6, many students cannot effectively access higher education and prove their ability to succeed without adequate
financial assistance. UMS received a 2005 report from Scannell and Kurz whose several recommendations serve as basis for the Committee’s recommendation here. Fuller discussion of Scannell and Kurz’s recommendations appears in Appendix B.7.

Actions:

1.7.1. Advocate for increasing the value of the Maine State scholarship program made available for Maine students pursuing higher education in Maine. Explore funding new sources such as “racino” receipts.

1.7.2. Launch a “Going to College Pays” promotional campaign that demonstrates financial benefits and affordability of public higher education. Position the UMS as first choice for MCCS graduates interested in pursuing four-year degrees through articulation, UMS to MCCS faculty relationships, sharing student success data, and development of merit scholarships specifically for transfers.

1.7.3. Develop pilot System-funded merit awards for high-achieving Maine students, thus ensuring full tuition funding for Pell Grant-eligible recipients. (This action assumes funding can be garnered from the State. If this pilot program proves effective and the State is willing to provide funding to support it, eligibility could be expanded to all Pell recipients.)

1.7.4. Assuming additional funding and institutional support, provide a guaranteed $2500 merit award for full-time resident freshmen ($5000 for full-time non-resident, non-NEBHE freshmen) with SAT scores of 1200 or higher; guarantee a $1500 merit scholarship for any full-time transfer student with a 3.0 GPA coming from an MCCS institution.

1.7.5. Monitor pricing and financial aid policies for shifts in relative price position that may impact student recruitment and retention.

Discussion. Of all of the Committee’s recommendations, this one costs new, up-front funds, and the first action under this Recommendation is to advocate for increasing the value of the Maine State scholarship program. As long as the State appropriation to the UMS is not increasing or increasing less than costs, UMS will be unable to provide adequate access for students without additional funds to cover increased costs of tuition. Hence, financial aid policies should be developed to encourage student success. Present State budget situation will determine the time line. Review should be on-going.

SD#1 Recommendation 8. Develop accountability measures demonstrating student success with respect to Recommendations 1-7 within the context of the various institutional missions of UMS institutions. Each previous recommendation has within it a set of specific actions measurable relative to the System as well as to the unique missions of the constituent institutions. Although always easy to identify and determine input measures of institutional profile, such as mean SAT for an entering class, or student
to faculty ratios, it is less easy to measure comprehensively output measures that actually demonstrate student success in achieving objectives. Some measures help to assess student success in moving toward degree completion—retention, progression, and graduation rates, for instance. Success at job placement may indicate student success, but getting a relevant job does not ensure keeping it or getting another job. Graduation and placement also do not ensure institutions have achieved their missions of educating citizens. We still need to know what students really learned, or what the value added of the degree program really was for a student. To assess that level of student success requires surveys of graduates some years after graduation relative to institutional values. That said, several specific measures nevertheless can provide some limited measure of success for UMS institutions with respect to putting recommendations into place.

**Actions:**

1.8.1. Work with recommendations from Strategic Direction # 6 on accountability relative to core values of the institution, specifically to develop post-graduate surveys.

1.8.2. Build and deploy measures of college readiness related to whether applicants meet expectations recommended for success courses; how effectively they test on placement exams, and how effectively they do in developmental courses.

1.8.3. Build and deploy measures related to supporting students for success, to include number of degree programs reviewed annually; general education outcomes established and implemented; students enrolled in and completing cooperative programs; associate degree programs continued; change in transfers students’ numbers and preparation, including by two-plus-two programs; financial aid available and used by students; and assessment and accountability measures in place.

1.8.4. Build and deploy measures for all students, not just first-time, full-time students (the usual cohort for such measures), related to student retention and progression to graduation relative to peer institutions. Assess improvement in institutional retention, progression, and graduation rates relative to institutional peers.

**Discussion.** Committee members feel strongly that simple input measures or rates of retention, progression, or graduation that employ only first-time, full-time students as the base cohort do not measure or indicate success for all students, which is why more complex measures are necessary to measure what is valued—student success. This recommendation does not preclude simple measures of progress for the System and its institutions in implementing Recommendations 1 to 7, but it does require an investment in assessing longer-term student success.

**C. How will we know?** In a letter from the Chancellor dated September 8, 2005, implementation committees were asked to comment on how one would know in two years that implementation had been successful. For Strategic Direction # 1, the answer is incorporated in its Recommendation 8, to develop accountability measures demonstrating
student success with respect to Recommendations 1-7 within the context of the various institutional missions of the University of Maine System institutions. Specifically, completion of Actions 1.8.2 to 1.8.4 would provide a basis for a measure of relative accomplishment of implementation of Strategic Direction # 1.

D. Budget. The Committee’s best estimates of costs are discussed within each recommendation. Only one recommendation, on financial aid, will require substantial new funds. Recommendation 8 on measurement will eventually require funds to develop longitudinal studies of graduates’ sense of their student success.

E. SD#1. Decision-Making Matrix. As demonstrated in the matrix below, some recommendations have a higher priority than others, largely due to the need to sequence recommendations. However, several recommendations can be implemented simultaneously and are largely independent of one another. Only Recommendation 7 on financial aid bears a potentially high cost, one for which advocacy for funding is essential and the first action step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Cost (financial and effort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Implementation Time Line. The Committee’s best estimates of time lines are discussed within each recommendation. Several recommendations can be implemented simultaneously, others require some limited sequencing. Many also require a process involving shared governance for implementation.
Appendices for Strategic Direction #1. Second Report

Appendix A. Following is the substantive discussion informing the Committee’s Preliminary May 2005 report. It focuses on student success and provides context for the recommendations in this Second Report.

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 adequately 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.

The Nature of Our Students. The Committee gave much discussion to understanding the nature of students in the University of Maine System. Many students who attend System institutions have less preparation than 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 university faculties 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 is female—up to 80% at some institutions. In general in higher education, many students also work full time, have significant family responsibilities, or experience significant physical, emotional, or mental health issues. Finally, an increasing number of students also attend more than one institution, even simultaneously, before completing a degree. As a result, some System institutions serve and graduate more degree completion students who have transferred in than initial access students, consistent with higher education trends nationally.

How does this situation affect students’ educational experience? 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. 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 provide opportunities for students to succeed. 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 and program objectives, not just input measures (e.g. faculty/student ratios) or progression through higher education (retention and graduation rates). But student success requires significant supports for
students due to their varying degrees of motivation and preparedness. 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 creatively 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.
Appendix B.1. The following actions are elaborations on the Committee’s recommendation regarding K-12—UMS Alignment and Collaboration. The Committee also suggests review of specific academic policy and catalog language as appropriate through processes of shared governance.

*Establishing a common minimum SAT score that represents the skill level needed to succeed in college-level courses—500 for English, 500 for Math. Students falling below the minimum SAT score will be required to take a placement test to determine proper placement in math, writing and reading courses.

*Develop a University of Maine System poster and brochure on college readiness to disseminate to school boards, administrators, and high school and middle school teachers and counselors. Support a College Ready website (www.collegeready.maine.edu) that is upgraded and updated on a regular basis.

*Include the following statement on the College Ready website and in all catalogs of the UMS universities:

Statement on College Readiness by the Chief Academic Offices of the University of Maine System:

While the seven campuses of the University of Maine System have different criteria for admission and placement, they all share a common understanding of what comprises an optimal, college-ready high school transcript. Students who succeed in college and graduate on time usually have the following high school preparation in the core academic areas:

• Four years of English courses that incorporate a variety of texts (fiction, non-fiction, essays, memoirs, journalism) and that emphasize expository and analytic writing skills.

• Four years of mathematics courses that include at least algebra I and II, geometry, and a 12th grade college-preparatory math course that provides a solid foundation in quantitative and algebraic reasoning. For those students planning to major in mathematics, science, or a technical or professional field that requires advanced math skills, a pre-calculus or calculus course is strongly recommended.

• At least three years of laboratory science—offered as either separate courses or as integrated core classes—that include the study of biology, chemistry, and physics. Science courses should emphasize the writing of technical reports and the quantitative representations and analyses of data.

• At least three years of history and social science in courses that emphasize reading of primary and secondary texts, writing of analytic and expository essays, and use of quantitative data and research findings.

• At least two years of study in a language other than English.

*Sponsor conversations among campus and high school faculty in each campus region concerning placement testing, college readiness, appropriate high school programming and college transition issues.

*Use scientifically validated placement tests to demonstrate reliable tools for assessing college readiness, and ensure multiple placement testing opportunities for Maine students, beginning with their junior year of high school.
*Work with K-12 educators to develop a twelfth grade curriculum for college-bound high school (and adult education) students whose 11th grade placement test results indicate insufficient college readiness.

*Explore opportunities for students to take developmental level course work during the summer before entering college.

*Examine and refine developmental courses.

*Examine learning outcomes and instructional strategies in all 100 level courses, with the goal of helping more students succeed, without lowering university standards.

**Appendix B.2.** Proposed modifications and revisions for BOT Policy on Program Review—for review by faculty senates, chief academic officers, and the Board of Trustees.

**Section 305.1 Program Approval, Review, Suspension and Elimination**

Effective: 1/29/87

Last Revised: 7/12/93; 7/97; 3/99; 10/00; 2006

**Procedures for Academic Program Approval, Review, Suspension, and Elimination**

**[Academic Program Approval]**

**Academic Program Review**

Academic program review must be institution-based and reflect an institution’s mission and capacity. Program review must focus on the substance of programs and must address the mission and capacity of programs to respond to student’s needs in relation to program objectives. They must demonstrate how programs balance program quality with student access and work to ensure student success, regardless how that success is defined.

Regular program assessment (and shifting the faculty culture to one that embraces assessment as part its professional activities) will improve the program review process. Specific identification of program goals and student learning objectives is a critical first step.

The purposes of the academic program review process are:

1. to provide a basis for ensuring that programs are maintained at the highest possible quality consistent with resources available,

2. to examine the resources available in support of the program and make recommendations concerning future resource allocation to the program,

3. to assess the priority of programs with the campus and System missions, and

4. to examine programs of questionable quality or questionable value to students for possible elimination or, if of high priority, for strengthening.

1. All academic degree programs are to be reviewed within an established time frame
not to exceed **ten years**. The schedule of academic program reviews is to be revised biennially in concert with the review and revision of the campus operational plan of which it becomes a part. Academic program review schedules are to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and any deviations from these review schedules must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Program review should be undertaken 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. Campus-level processes should be developed for programs less than degree-level.

2. **Academic program review should** ensure broad institutional and community representation in the process, including but not limited to community college system faculty and staff, or program alumni. Structures and mechanisms that blend academic affairs and student affairs in a constructive fashion should be encouraged.

3. The program review process on each campus should include:

   a. a self-study by the unit being reviewed.

   The self-study should include:
   • rationale for the program
     * program objectives for student engagement (such as defined by the National Survey of Student Engagement) and success.
   • five-year summary of program enrollment (number of majors and number of graduates)
   • course section enrollments
   • number of full-time faculty equivalents
   • budgets
   • an assessment of progress made in relation to the recommendations of previous program reviews.
     * an assessment of the alignment of student learning outcomes with the nature of students in the program, and of teaching effectiveness with respect to the student learning outcomes.
     * an assessment of the program’s contribution to general education, as appropriate, and an assessment of general education’s contribution to the program.
     * an assessment of relevance of library resources and information literacy as appropriate to the program.
     * evaluation of faculty development and instructional improvement/pedagogy that take into account the nature of students and their learning capacities

   In addition, the self-study should discuss the relation of the program to the campus mission.

   Evaluation of student progress and retention and graduation rates should be aligned with the nature of students and their needs.
The review should address complementarity within and collaboration across the System, standards to be met, when and where programs are offered, and mechanisms to provide program access.

The self-study should address the quality of the faculty and the methods used to ensure that quality (such as post-tenure review practices). The quality and appropriateness of the curriculum should be examined, with attention to such matters as student outcomes assessment and pluralistic perspectives.

b. a report by external reviewers based on a review of the self-study, additional materials as required, and a site visit.

c. a final report by the campus, endorsed by the President.

The final report should include:
• a statement on how the program enhances the mission of the campus
• a statement on the value of the program to the state and the nation
• a set of recommendations, with rationale, for future action, and
• budget implications based on the self-study and the external review.

Attention should be given to whether or not a program having had few graduates over a period of years as well as low course section enrollments should be continued. Professional accreditation processes may substitute for appropriate components of this section.

3. The final report, external review, and self-study will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by July 30 in the year the review is conducted. The Vice Chancellor will review the documents submitted and, based on this review, will recommend that the Chancellor accept the review and the recommendations in the final report and initiate any appropriate action(s), or recommend that the Chancellor meet with the campus President to discuss the review documents and possible future actions, including consideration of program elimination.

Institutions and the System should fully vet program reviews and provide adequate responses and feedback to programs.

Program review documents will be kept on file in the Chancellor’s Office where they can be reviewed by members of the Board of Trustees.

4. Program reviews carried out during the previous two years shall become a part of the biennial review and revision of the campus operational plan and the recommendations emanating from the review should be taken into consideration in the development of the biennial budget request.

5. Funding for external reviews will be provided through a special fund in the budget of the University of Maine System.

[Academic Program Suspension]

[Academic Program Elimination]
Appendix B.3. Following is an alphabetically ordered compendium of explicit general education objectives at UMS institutions. The compendium is intended as suggestive, not prescriptive. Any approach to general education must reflect NEASC requirements as well as individual institutional missions and capacities.

Aesthetics
Citizenship/Service
Collaboration
Communications
Critical Thinking
Cultural Awareness
Diversity/Viewpoint
Environmental/Sustainability
Ethics
Historical/Social
Interdisciplinary
Literary (and general literacies)
Specific Artistic Experience
Science
Wellness

Appendix B.4. Effective collaborative delivery of programs. UMS is committed to delivery of higher education resources in radically different ways and seeking a combination of the best service and the best education for the citizens of Maine. As the primary broker of higher education resources for Maine students, the collaborative delivery of courses and academic degree programs within the University of Maine System's seven institutions are a powerful higher education model.

A number of educational initiatives are evidence of the increasingly articulated relationships among these institutions. Examples include the UM/USM Ph.D. program in the biosciences, the USM/UMPI Master's program in Educational Leadership, and the UMA/UMF Bachelor's Degree in Art. Success in collaboration will be measured by the graduation rates for brokered degrees, the proportion of students who achieve their educational goals, and an increase in the overall post-secondary educational attainment in the region. Principles for collaboration should include:

Partnership. Cooperative Delivery Degree programs are those academic degree programs delivered in partnership within the University of Maine System. The general direction of the shared vision – regional cultural diversity, community involvement, cross-disciplinary approaches, and cooperation with other institutions, will enable students in the UMS to pursue educational opportunities enhanced by the resources of each participating institution. Academic partnerships are the ‘right’ thing to do.

Collaboration. Through collaborative, cooperative degree programs, UMS partner institutions, their faculty and academic programs are able to offer selective undergraduate and graduate programs that no one institution could support by itself. Since the programs are offered at more than one campus, each partner institution is able to provide students access not only to inter-
institutional programs, but also to faculty members from across the entire region, and a
community of scholars from throughout the University of Maine system.

Transparency. Students pursuing a cooperative degree program must be assured of transparency. Students must be able to register at one UMS institutions, and that institution be the “home” institution for the student. All student records should be maintained by that institution, and the degree be issued by that institution when the student has completed the program.

Academic planning and shared knowledge between faculty members in cooperative academic programs will be the keys to making advisement, enrollment and ultimately a seamless transition for UMS students. Faculty within these programs must consult with one another as they develop collaborative programs to ensure that all courses work well together so that students have a coherent program.

Resource Needs. Within higher education in Maine, there is not only the room but also the need for institutions to focus on their strengths. Specialized institutions with different approaches to learning and varied academic and research priorities are more likely to serve the diverse needs of students, develop innovative programs, and provide the greatest value for funding support. Currently, however, structural issues impose substantial challenges to greater institutional/system collaboration. Gaps in the current funding framework, at the levels of both institutional funding and student assistance, make collaborative or transfer programs difficult to develop. Addressing these gaps will eliminate one important barrier to inter-system student mobility.

Appendix B.5. Principles for development, continuation, or elimination of Associate Degree Programs. The following principle should govern continuation of associate degree programs:

Maine Community College Capacity and Commitment. Any phase-out of an associate degree program should require:
- significant reduction in demand for the program OR
- demonstrated capacity and commitment on the part of the MCCS to initiate delivery of the program OR
- demonstrated capacity and commitment on the part of the MCCS to absorb more associate degree students into its pre-existing, corresponding program(s) OR
- suitable, alternate associate degree within the UMS to serve the students’ needs.

Public Health and Safety Needs. UMS should support unique associate degrees that serve Maine’s need for qualified personnel in areas of public health and safety.

Student Needs. UMS should consider the practical and motivational needs of Maine’s ever increasing non-traditional and part-time student populations when making decisions regarding associate degree availability within the UMS.

Cost Efficiency. To ensure the most efficient use of public funds the UMS should retain unique (niche) programs in situation where:
- it has already invested heavily in fixed (non-transferable), essential program assets unique to a particular associate degree OR
- baccalaureate and associate degree programs share access to an essential and unique campus asset(s) and duplication by MCCS would be needlessly expensive.
**Geographic Access.** UMS should recognize geography as a very real impediment to access to Maine Community College programs and its responsibility to assist in preserving access to associate degree programming in all regions of the state.

**Quality.** As gateways to baccalaureate education, UMS associate degree programs should continue to maintain the same high standards of academic quality as bachelor degree programs.

**Appendix B.6. Principles for development of two-plus-two degree programs.** The following principles should govern development of two-plus-two degree programs:

**Curriculum Development.** Curriculum development should take place within the context of the total UMS and MCCS. Institutions within both systems should consult with each other in the early stages of program and curriculum development and seek opportunities to build two-plus-two and/or other articulation arrangements. UMS institutions should be open to the possibilities of developing mutually beneficial articulation agreements with accredited institutions that award associate degrees.

**Professional Pathways.** Institutions should seek and engage in two-plus-two and/or other articulation agreements to create professional advancement opportunities for students. Maine citizens need increased opportunities to obtain a baccalaureate degree education. Institutions should create appropriate alignments of associate to baccalaureate education such as the recently developed Bachelor of Applied Science programs offered by UMA and UMPI.

**Commitment to Students.** Institutions should work to create successful transfer experiences for students characterized by consistent communication and institutional policies and procedures that ease the transfer process.

**Credentials and Curriculum.** Faculty members in potential two-plus-two programs should be appropriately credentialed. “ Appropriately credentialed” may mean that faculty members teaching at the associate degree level may be differently credentialed than faculty members teaching at the baccalaureate level. All faculty members teaching in a field will have the credentials for that field, a closely related one, or professional experience of an equivalent magnitude. Curriculum objectives of the associate degree should equate well with the expected knowledge and skills needed for success in the baccalaureate degree.

**Appendix B.7. Financial Aid.** In 2005, UMS contracted with the consulting firm, Scannell & Kurz, to review the strategic use of financial aid within the System. In Phase 1 of the work (specific to the System as a whole), the following issues were explored:

- Understand who is currently served and not served by the System;

- Determine the best strategic use of the System’s financial aid dollars to attract and retain qualified students;

- Understand the need and price sensitivity of both prospective and current students in order to provide guidance on pricing strategies;

- Help make the case for financial aid support to legislators and potential donors.
Subsequent to this review, a series of recommendations were made. The recommendations fall into four categories: The University of Maine System should:

-Devise a strategy to work with legislators and funding agencies to increase the aid available for Maine’s students;

-Launch a marketing/promotional campaign that demonstrates the financial benefits and affordability of public higher education and should position itself to become the top choice for MCCS transfers;

-Carefully monitor any pricing and financial aid policies that may impact student recruitment and retention; and

-Develop System-based merit awards for high quality Maine students, and full funding for Pell grant recipients.

Strategic Direction #1 Committee’s recommendations are based on the extensive study done by Scannell & Kurz:

**Category: Advocacy for Increased State Support**

Recommendation #1: To prosper in a human capital economy, the State of Maine has to support its higher education institutions and citizens to maximize postsecondary education enrollments and retention. This will require dedicating increased State resources to continue to secure access (financial aid) and quality educational opportunity (subsidy per students) at State-supported institutions.

*Interpretation of this recommendation based on other language within the Phase 1 report:* The University of Maine System, the Maine Community College System and other Maine higher education institutions will work with FAME to support increasing the amount of the Maine State scholarship program made available for Maine students who pursue higher education in Maine.

*Comments:* The Maine State Grant program currently awards $1000 per year to Maine residents for students attending public institutions in Maine full time ($500 for part time); students attending private institutions are awarded $1250. Students attending out-of-state receive $500 for attending a public institution and $1000 for attending a private institution. This is a need based award (and student must file the FAFSA by May 1 to be considered). Questions: Should this scholarship be focused on students studying in state? Students who complete their education in a state tend to try to reside in that state after graduation – this ties into workforce development aspirations for the state. Could this grant help to fund the recommendation below regarding covering full tuition for Pell grant recipients? Could the UMS and MCCS alternatively ask for an increase in appropriation to fund increased financial aid for the neediest students?

The SD#1 committee supports this recommendation and asks that planning proceed. Action steps to occur:

-Confirm estimate to fund full tuition for Pell grant recipients

-Determine current level of unmet need for Maine students enrolled in public higher education
Pull together a task force/committee comprised of UMS and MCCS to devise a strategy for advocacy and the appropriate approach to take for increased funding.

Revisit the deadline to encourage adult participation and/or explore other avenues of funding for part-time, adult students.

**Category:** Promotional campaign that demonstrates the financial benefits/affordability of public higher education; positioning the System to be the top choice for MCCS graduates

**Recommendation #1:** The University of Maine System, the Maine Community College System, the Finance Authority of Maine, the Mitchell Institute, the Maine Business Council and other appropriate stakeholders need to launch a Statewide, multi-media marketing campaign entitled “Going to College Pays.”

**Comment:** Equating the long-term financial benefits of degree attainment is an important message to convey to the people of Maine, and will aid in both building aspirations for higher education and college attendance. With a preponderance of the students within both UMS and MCCS having high financial need, conveying the messages of affordability and value are critical messages. Such a campaign could also tie into the work of the Compact for Higher Education.

UMS could also consider a campaign that is focused solely on UMS campuses for such a message.

The SD#1 committee agrees with this recommendation. Action steps to occur:

- Pull together a task force/committee of UMS and MCCS to devise a marketing strategy
- Incorporate into the work of SD#9

**Recommendation #2:** Position the System to be the top choice for what is likely to be an increasing number of Maine Community College System graduates interested in pursuing a four year degree.

**Comment:** The promotional campaign can have an impact on this population as well as it addresses the benefits of baccalaureate and graduate degree completion. A message that encourages further higher education, combined with financial aid incentives (see later recommendation) to enable matriculation, can grow this population on our campuses. A critical component of this recommendation includes developing close UMS-MCCS collaboration such as 1) developing strong articulation agreements, 2) building faculty-to-faculty relationships between regionally aligned UMS-MCCS institutions, 3) sharing data on how the academic and financial needs of MCCS graduates are being met by UMS, and 4) offering a merit for these transfers (see below for more on this). The first three items in this component should be addressed as part of other SD#1 goals.

The SD#1 committee agrees with this recommendation. Action steps to occur:

- Incorporate this message into an overarching promotional/marketing campaign
- Incorporate the UMS-MCCS collaboration into SD#1 recommendations and into UMS strategic plan implementation
- Explore the merit award recommendation as discussed below
Category: Monitor any pricing and policy decisions that may impact recruitment and retention

Recommendation #1: The System should monitor campus tuition increases to avoid dramatic shifts in relative price position.

Comments: The UMS Office of Planning and Policy Analysis has data on the level of unmet need among students on our campuses. This data does come into play in any determination of tuition increases. As tuition goes up, the level of unmet need also increases assuming no new infusion of financial aid dollars. S-K made the recommendation that the average in-state tuition should stay within 20-25% of average Maine per capita income and that average out-of-state keeps to no more than $6000-$8000 above the in-state tuition of other New England public institutions (until a repositioning is made possible by the strengthening quality and prestige factors of the UMS institutions).

The SD#1 committee agrees with this recommendation. Action steps to occur:

- Incorporate a price elasticity analysis into the determination of tuition increases
- Monitor tuition increases based on the “rule” articulated within the S-K financial aid study

Recommendation #2: Given that high levels of unmet need contribute to attrition, campuses should carefully review any financial aid policies that would result in a reduction of grant assistance to continuing students.

Comments: This seems like an obvious recommendation.

The SD#1 committee agrees with this recommendation. Action steps to occur:

- All campuses should review their financial aid policies to ensure that reductions in grant assistance to continuing students are minimal.

Category: Develop System-based merit awards for qualified students and guarantee full tuition for maximum Pell grant recipients

Recommendation #1: Guarantee any full time resident freshman or transfer eligible for a maximum Pell grant that full tuition will be covered from grant from all sources (including merit). If this pilot program can be proven effective and the State is willing to provide funding in support of it, eligibility could be expanded to all Pell recipients.

Comments: The estimate for this pilot full tuition guarantee appears to be minimal (but should be verified with S&K). Its goal is to increase the number of maximum Pell eligible students who apply to UMS. If it proved effective in increasing enrollment within the System, then the System could advocate with the State for more UMS funding to provide funding to support expanding eligibility to all Pell recipients. The calculations for the cost/NTR of this program should be explored further as it is both quite expensive and does not result in significant NTR. It could, however, dramatically impact enrollment as more Pell eligible students would elect to stay in Maine. New money would be needed to fund this expansion of aid. This recommendation would require the UMS to devise a strategy to approach the legislature regarding increasing appropriation to fund this.
The SD#1 committee suggests further review of this proposal including the formulation of a strategy to garner more state support (and resources) for financial aid of this kind.

Recommendation #2: Market a guaranteed merit award of $2500 for full time residents freshmen ($5000 for full time non resident, non NEBHE freshmen) with SAT scores of 1200+.

Comments: The estimate for this simulation shows an increase in enrollment, NTR and institutional grant. The benefit of a System merit (as opposed to campus based) is that these students would not also be receiving merits from individual campuses (from which they may currently receive more than one offer) – a System based merit would go to a student who could then use it on any campus. Assuming new funding for these System-based merits, the campuses could then redistribute their funds to other forms of financial aid. It is imperative that the campuses not be expected to fund this new initiative for the System but rather that they be able to reallocate their own merit dollars into other forms of aid, hence making a new funding source for a System-based merit critical. This issue is politically sensitive and each campus needs to determine its stance on this idea. In addition, the System needs to determine the best approach to obtaining the funding necessary to award these scholarships (which could not be implemented until the Fall 07 entering class).

The SD#1 committee suggests further review of this recommendation to include: forming an interinstitutional committee to review the recommendation; determining the source of funding; devising the strategy for awarding of these System-based merits (that conforms to the timeline for admission).

Recommendation #3: Guarantee a merit scholarship of $1500 to any full time transfers coming from an MCCS institution with a 3.0 GPA.

Comments: This award combined with a marketing campaign could be an effective tool for encouraging more students with two-year degrees to pursue their baccalaureate degree. The $1500 amount effectively “bridges the gap” between the tuition at MCCS and the tuition within the System. Again, such an award would require a new source of funding.

The SD#1 committee suggests further review of this recommendation to determine the source of funding and to devise the strategy for awarding this scholarship.