



STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

February 2005



Introduction

When the Board of Trustees voted to adopt the University of Maine System's Strategic Plan on September 20, 2004, it initiated a process of collaboration among faculty, administration, students, and staff that would lead to strengthened academic programming, greater economic sustainability, and expanded educational opportunities for all Mainers. This next important step, the Implementation Planning Process, is both expansive and structured, and addresses both immediate and long-term goals for improving all aspects of the University of Maine System.

Whereas the Strategic Plan outlines nine strategic areas for advancement, the Implementation Planning Process is the fulfillment of these recommendations and will require unprecedented collaboration, action, and leadership among constituents at each university, as well as the System Office. The UMS is committed to ensuring full participation by faculty, students, and staff since during the Strategic Planning process members of the community expressed a desire that the Implementation Planning Process bring together those who have responsibility for the various areas affected by the Strategic Plan.

After months of comprehensive analysis, dialogue, research, and feedback among Presidents, faculty and administrators at the campus and System levels, a clear plan for positive change has emerged. This Implementation Planning Process establishes a network of committees from both the campus and System levels charged with carrying out the objectives of the Strategic Plan. The recommendations that are put forward by the committees will be considered by the Presidents and Chancellor for final implementation.

Implementation for each Strategic Direction will be led by two to three committees comprised of experts and representatives in the area of focus. In order to ensure a balanced perspective and fully integrated outcomes, committees for each strategic direction will include faculty members, students, and administrators, and each will be overseen by a Coordinating Chair (or Chairs) who reports to the Chancellor. The Coordinating Chairs are in charge of communication between committee members. The Board of Trustees will receive briefings on Implementation Planning from the Chancellor at every Board meeting. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and other appropriate committees will review all the reports and recommendations submitted by the committees for each strategic direction.

The Planning Process consists of a set of overarching "Guiding Principles" to guide committee members as they consider each step of the Implementation Process; an "Implementation Model" showing the overall committee structure; and a nine-part document detailing the committee structure, goals, approaches, outcomes, and timelines for each strategic direction. The timelines are estimates, and may be adjusted as the Planning Process evolves.

Guiding Principles

The University of Maine System Strategic Plan was developed through a process of careful assessment, feedback, analysis, and renewed vision for improving the State's public university system. But it is only a beginning. The principles and strategic directions laid out in the Strategic Plan form the framework for the important process of implementation.

In order for the implementation plan to be successful, it will require the active participation of faculty, students, administrators, and staff from all UMS institutions, with a shared commitment to improving the quality and sustainability of each university and the System as a whole, in accordance with the UMS Strategic Plan.

Implementation planning of each strategic direction will be led by a work group of constituents from UMS institutions based on existing committee structures, where appropriate, who will be responsible for developing recommendations for their strategic direction. Though implementation may take up to four to five years to fully complete, many elements of the Plan can be realized much sooner. Below are guiding principles for each work group to follow throughout the implementation process:

Inclusiveness. The implementation plan must be an inclusive process, with contributions from faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders throughout the community, including boards of visitors.

Priorities. The educational, cultural, and economic needs of the citizens of Maine must remain a top priority in every stage of the implementation process.

Integration. The implementation plan must be campus-based as well as System-wide, and support a clear vision for the University System's relationship to other educational systems in the State, including K-12 and the Community College System.

Quality. Implementation of each strategic direction must be guided by an effort to raise the level of quality of offerings and services at UMS institutions.

Collaboration. Not only is collaboration necessary for implementation planning to be successful, but improved collegiality among faculty, staff, and students System-wide will enrich the academic climate in the future, reduce competition among our universities, and result in efficiencies and cost savings.

Communication. Work groups have a responsibility to communicate with campus-based communities as well as established stakeholders, and must be open to a free exchange of ideas amongst each other and with those affected by the implementation plan. Furthermore, members of work groups must be sensitive to adverse impacts on individuals and institutions as a result of implementation planning, and address positive and productive ways of working with them.

continued

Optimal Use of Technology. Throughout implementation planning, there should be an emphasis on maximizing use of new technologies, and making investments that will both expand access to educational opportunities and create economic efficiencies.

Reality. The implementation plan must address the economic realities the System faces today and in the future, and must provide a path toward a financially sustainable System.

Advancement. In addition to creating efficiencies, the implementation plan must also clearly articulate the University System's role as an economic engine for the State of Maine.

Respect for Culture. The implementation plan must continue to acknowledge and value the vital social and cultural roles our universities embrace, supporting creative endeavor and accentuating the uniqueness of Maine, including its Native American, Franco-American, and Acadian heritages.

Attention to Diversity. The implementation plan must fully incorporate the University System's commitment to diversity, affirmative action, and the goal of providing access to educational opportunities for all Mainers.

Organization. The implementation plan for each strategic direction must create an effective framework for decision-making, resource allocation, prioritization, and accountability.

Leadership. In order for the State and the University System to move forward educationally and economically, implementation of the Strategic Plan must represent thoughtful and responsible leadership, reflecting best practices from within the System and beyond.

IMPLEMENTATION MODEL

Bold indicates primary group

STRATEGIC DIRECTION	SYSTEM LEVEL - NEW COMMITTEE	SYSTEM LEVEL - EXISTING COMMITTEE	CAMPUS LEVEL
#1 - Academic quality/academic program planning		Chief Academic Officers; Chief Student Affairs Officers	Campus Committee
#2 - Faculty/staff development	System Committee (new)	Chief Academic Officers	Campus Committee
#3 - Distance Education	System Committee (new)		Campus Committee
#4 - Libraries		Chief Academic Officers; Library Directors; Chief Information Officers	Campus Committee
#5 - Research	System Committee (new)		Campus Committee
#6 - Accountability	System Committee (new): Chancellor, Presidents, Staff		Campus Committee
#7 - Centralization		Transforming Higher Education Integrated Services (THESIS); Project Core Team; Executive Advisory Committee; Information Technology Committee; Chief Financial Officers	Campus Committee
#8 - Restructuring	System Committees (new): Outreach Centers, Higher Education Park		Campus Committee
#9 - Advocacy	System Committee (new)		

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 1 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 1 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 1. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chair: Joseph Wood

System-level Committee (existing)

Chair: Joseph Wood (USM)
Members: President Cynthia Huggins (UMM)
 Kathleen Dexter (UMA)
 John Murphy (UMFK)
 Kim Page (UMM)
 Kurt Hofmann (UMPI)
 Craig Hutchinson (USM)
 Bonnie Sparks (UC)
 Rosa Redonnett (USM)
 Sheri Fraser (UMA)
 Robert Dana (UM)
 Chris Legore (UMA)
 Scott Voisine (UMFK)
cont.

System-level Committee (existing) cont.

Jean Cashman (UMPI)
 Faculty Board Rep:
 Grace Denison (UMF)
 Student Board Rep: Whitney
 Bouchard (UMFK)
 Shannon Collins (UMA)
 William Otto (UMM)
 David Townsend (UM)
 Brenda McAleer (UMA)
 Dahlia Lynn (USM)
 Bradley Ritz (UMFK)
 Mary Schwanke (UMF)
 Stephen Gilson (UM)

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

The Strategy #1 Committee’s goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to create parameters to:

- Develop clear criteria for an Academic Program Planning process that emphasizes quality, is campus-based, and led by the faculty, with collaboration between and among campuses as needed;
- Establish appropriate student/faculty ratios as well as faculty/staff ratios, consistent with the Carnegie classification of each university and its mission;
- Set and achieve specific enrollment targets;
- Set State-wide minimum standards for retention rates, consistent with the Carnegie classification of each university and its mission;
- Set State-wide minimum standards for graduation rates, consistent with the Carnegie classification of each university and its mission;

(continued next page)

- Provide student support by requesting additional funding for financial aid;
- Develop and improve academic support services, which will enhance the ability of traditional and non-traditional students to achieve their academic potential;
- Continue to provide access to non-traditional students by developing and sustaining academically enriched “two plus two” programs. Two plus two programs lead students to successful completion of a baccalaureate degree by allowing them to enter higher education through an associate degree program, a community college, and/or through the lower division of a baccalaureate degree; and
- Work cooperatively with the Maine Community College System to address the need for Associate Degree Programs.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #1 Committee should focus on five major areas:

- Academic Programming: assurance of quality, clarity of missions and niches
- Student Services: financial aid funding, enrollment management, retention
- “Two Plus Two”: need for associate degree programs; partnership with community college system; and inter/intra-campus transferability
- Program Capacity
- Other: to be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 1 will be responsible for developing the parameters by which academic program planning (APP) will be conducted throughout the System. Through the Coordinating Chair, the committees will submit their recommended parameters to the campuses for approval before moving on to the next phase of planning. Following final campus approval of the parameters set forth by the Strategic Direction 1 committees, they will submit their final parameters to the Chancellor for approval, at which point implementation will begin. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the campuses

↓

October 30: Campuses approve/revise recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the campuses

↓

January 30: Campuses approve/revise recommendations

↓

February 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

March 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 2 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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

Implementation of Strategic Direction 2 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 2. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: President Theodora Kalikow

System-level Committee (new)

Chairs: President Theodora Kalikow (UMF)
Vice Chancellor Nunez (UMS)

Members:

- Faculty Board Rep: H. Fred Walker (USM)
- Rachel Albert (UMFK)
- Christine Standefer (UMPI)
- Shallee Page ((UMM)
- James Toner (UM)
- Douglas Ruthven (UM)
- Marie Hayes (UM)
- Norma Bisulca (UMA)
- Terry Murphy (UMFK)
- Waleck Dalpour (UMF)
- Virginia Nees-Hatlen (UM)
- Student Board Rep: Zak Smith (UMPI)
- Daniel Buckley (UMF)

Staff:

- Tracy Bigney (UMS)

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

System-level Committee (existing)

Members:

- Rachel Albert (UMFK)
- Allen Berger (UMF)
- Joe Wood (USM)
- Dick Randall (UMA)
- Dick Kimball (UMPI)
- John Mahon (UM)
- Stuart Swain (UMM)

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #2 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- 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;
 - Strengthen criteria and implementation for faculty review;
 - Find new ways to enable faculty interaction and exchange of ideas;
 - Set targets for endowed professorships as well as targets for endowed chairs;
 - Provide faculty with availability of technology in the classroom;
 - Set higher standards for programs and activities for faculty and staff development and invest in those programs;
 - Provide appropriate staff to support faculty to enable them to increase their productivity; and
- Develop a System-wide faculty development program, including mentoring, which is designed by the faculty with input from the System Office.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #2 Committee should focus on three major areas:

- Professional Development: faculty and staff, faculty interaction, endowments
- Compensation Goals and Programs: compensation and incentives, enhanced administrative services for faculty
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 2 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chairs, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 3 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 3 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 3. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: President Cynthia Huggins
Gerry Dube

System-level Committee (new)

Chairs: President Cynthia Huggins (UMM)
Gerry Dube (UMS)

Members: President Cynthia Huggins (UMM)
Faculty Board Rep: Allen Salo (UMPI)
Gerard NeCastro (UMM)
John Forker (UMA)
Christine LeGore (UMA)
Bonnie Sparks (UC)
Cathy Newell (Maine Adult Education Association)
Ray Poulin (UM)
Robert Ellis (UC)
Robert Hansen (USM)
Robert White (UM)
Linda Graves (UMPI)
Christy Hammer (USM)
Nory Jones (UM)
Randall Kindleberger (UMM)
Joseph Zubrick (UMFK)
Jodi Williams (UMS)
Lorraine Spenciner (UMF)
Graduate-level Distance Education Rep
Student Board Rep: Brandon Libby (UM)
Leah Malave (UMA)
Robert Ayer (UMA)

Staff: James Breece (UMS)

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #3 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- Administratively connect each University College Center to a UMS university to enable greater access and responsiveness to student needs;
- Better utilize faculty expertise in developing a greater array of online programs;
- Develop a model with faculty input to expand academic offerings online, recognizing that all academic programs originate at the campus level;
- Provide quality standards and oversight to ensure that online programs contribute to the System's "quality" goals;
- Position the University College Centers as an important component of the System's Distance Education programs;
- Work with the faculty on each campus to allow acceptance of online courses offered by other institutions to fulfill program requirements;
- Continue to work with the Maine Community College System on academic offerings and administrative oversight of selected University/MCCS-run Centers, and explore developing academic programs that can be offered online;
- Work with K-12 to better leverage the Maine Department of Education's Distance Learning infrastructure and electronic classrooms located at most high schools, using new technology to provide the services to sites in other parts of Maine;
- Investigate the potential for special arrangements with carriers and other parties who provide the transport systems for present and future technologies;
- Develop a management system for the delivery of Distance Education programming that encompasses present and future technologies; and
- Investigate, develop, and implement new technologies to more broadly distribute academic offerings, both synchronously and asynchronously, eventually allowing students to receive courses on their home computers. The goal is that students can have access to academic programs at any time and place.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #3 Committee should focus on four major areas:

- Technology: technical standards, ATM systems, new and emerging technologies
- Services: site management, collaboration with community colleges, K-12, budgets, and centralized services
- Programming: needs assessment, assuring high-quality, University College centers
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 3 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chairs, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 4 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

Strategic Direction 4 - Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a State-wide digital library to support all citizens of Maine.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 4 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 4. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: Thomas Abbott
Rachel Albert

System-level Committee (existing)

Members:

Rachel Albert (UMFK)
 Thomas Abbott (UMA)
 Joyce Rumery (UM)
 Sharon Johnson (UMFK)
 Gregory Curtis (UMPI)
 Frank Roberts (UMF)
 Bert Phipps (UMM)
 David Nutty (USM)
 William Wells (USM)
 Gary Nichols (Maine State Library)
 Barbara McDade (Bangor Public Library)
 Susan Lowe (UC/UMA)
 Gerry Dube (UMS)
 Kathleen March (UM)

cont.

bold indicates primary level

System-level Committee (existing) cont.

Evelyn Greenlaw (USM)
 Michael Kimball (UMM)
 Rodney Bushway (UM)
 Robert Rice (UM)
 Christine Hepler (Maine Law)
 Marilyn Lutz (UM)
 Laura Gallucci (UM)
 Jerome Gamache (UMA)
 Eric Brown (UMF)
 Nancy Bouzrara (USM)
 Faculty Board Rep: Allen Salo (UMPI)
 Vice Chancellor Nunez (UMS)

Staff:

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

II. GOALS

The Strategy #4 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the State;
- Develop an effective and collaborative UMS library system consortium founded on one strong, well-funded research library at the University of Maine;
- Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the State-wide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine; and
- Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #4 Committee should focus on five major areas:

- Collaboration: between UMS library consortium and libraries throughout the State
- Access: expansion of digital library; technological advancements and training
- Research Library: improving and restoring Fogler Library's resources
- Base Budget: establishing permanent financing for the State-wide digital library
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 4 will be responsible, through its Coordinating Chair, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 5 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 5 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 5. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: Michael Eckardt
Julie Ellis

System-level Committee (new)

Chairs: Michael Eckardt (UM)
Julie Ellis (USM)

Members:

- Faculty Board Rep: Carol Kontos (UMA)
- Margo Wood (USM)
- Dan Sandweiss (UM)
- Rita Heimes (Maine Law)
- Lynn Bromley (Committee on Business, Research, and Economic Development)
- Jake Ward (UM)
- Richard Kimball (UMPI)
- Cathleen McAnneny (UMF)
- JoAnne Wallingford (UMPI)
- Ellen Hostert (UMM)
- Steve Selva (UMFK)
- George Jacobson (UM)
- Ronald Norton (UMA)
- Samantha Langley-Turnbaugh (USM)
- Janet Yancey-Wrona (Department of Economic and Community Development)
- Student Board Rep: Chad Walls
- State Rep: Tom Saviello

Staff: John Lisnik (UMS)

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #5 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- Request additional Maine Economic Improvement Fund (MEIF) funding from the State to support sponsored research;
- Strengthen sponsored research by coordinating the process for requesting increased funding by forging one voice for advocacy, planning, and development;
- Set greater incentives for faculty research, scholarship, and creative expression, including appropriately adjusting teaching loads;
- Increase graduate fellowships across the System;
- Support faculty in generating grants that will expand and support their research, scholarship, and creative expression; and
- Enhance the graduate education experience and build the System's research and scholarly capacity.
- Expand opportunities for undergraduate research.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #5 Committee should focus on four major areas:

- Advocacy: seeking funding from the State, businesses and individuals
- Faculty and Student Support: generating grant dollars and expanding faculty research; increases in graduate fellowships
- Coordinated Approach: to lobby for Federal and State funding with a research agenda
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 5 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chairs, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 6 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 6 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 6. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chair: Chancellor Joseph Westphal

System-level Committee (new)

Chair: Chancellor Joseph Westphal (UMS)

Members:

President Richard Pattenaude (USM)
Richard Barringer (USM)
John Mahon (UM)
Stephen Hansen (UMFK)
Gary Page (UMA)
Thomas Parchman (USM)
Steve Quackenbush (UMF)
Faculty Board Rep: Dana
Humphrey (UM)
Barbara Blackstone (UMPI)
Kay Kimball (UMM)
Robert Strong (UM)
Donald Zillman (Maine Law)
Student Board Rep: Sarah Knight

Staff:

James Breece (UMS), Joanne
Yestramski (UMS)

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have a committee

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #6 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- 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; and
- Establish a performance-based funding component of funding..

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #6 Committee should focus on five major areas:

- Assessment/Evaluation: campus-based strategic plans, enrollment, retention, and graduation rates, performance-based funding, measurable outcomes
- Budgets: renewed capital assets, facilities planning, financial management, budget model tied to Strategic Plan
- Leadership Development
- Allocation Formulas
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 6 will be responsible for submitting recommendations for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 7 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 7 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 7. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: Allen Berger,
Tracy Bigney, Joanne Yestramski,
President Richard Pattenaude

System-level Committee (existing)

Chairs: Allen Berger
Rosa Redonnett

Members: ***Transforming Higher Education Student Integrated Services (THESIS)**
Project Core Team:
Laurie Pruett (UMA)
Marty Berry (USM)
Dennis Casey (UM)
Alison Cox (UMS)
Peggy Crawford (UM)
Pam Ford-Taylor (UMA)
Jon Henry (UMS)
Lynda Kinley (UMF)
Chris Legore (UMA)
Steve Rand (USM)
Lorelei Locke (UMPI)

Executive Advisory Committee:
Allen Berger (UMF)
Rosa Redonnet (USM)
Doug Gelinias (UM)
Laurie Pruett (UMA)
Richard Campbell (UMA)
Tracy Elliot (UMS)
Richard Kimball (UMPI)
John Murphy (UMFK)
Mary Stover (UMM)
Virginia Gibson (UM)
Mark Kamen (UMS)

Faculty Board Rep: Dana Humphrey (UM)
Student Board Rep: Bradley Dean (UMF)

cont.

System-level Committees (existing) cont.

Human Resource and Equal Opportunity Committee:
Chair: Tracy Bigney (UMS)
Members: Catherine Pease (UM)
Sheri Stevens (UMA)
Laurie Gardner (UMF)
Tamara Mitchell (UMFK)
Judy Jewell (UMA)
Sally Dobres (UMS)
Susan Nichols (UM)
Valerie Huebner (UMF)
Jean Schild (UMM)
Barbara DVaney (UMPI)
Kathleen Roberts (USM)
Thomas Potter (UMM)
Carolyn Cheney (UMPI)
Kathleen Bouchard (USM)
Student Board Rep: Bradley Dean (USM)
Faculty Board Rep: Dana Humphrey (UM)

Business Operations:
Chair : Joanne Yestramski (UMS)
Members: Richard Campbell (UMA)
Janet Waldron (UM)
Roger Spear (UMF)
John Murphy (UMFK)
Thomas Potter (UMM)
Charlie Bonin (UMPI)
Sam Andrews (USM)

cont. next page

System-level Committees (existing) cont.

Information Technology:

Chair: President Richard Pattenaude (USM)

Members: James Breece (UMS)

Robert White (UM)

Joanne Yestramski (UMS)

Kevin Mallet (Executive Alliance)

Gerry Dube (UMS)

Roger Spear (UMF)

Cindy Mitchell (UMS)

Campus Committees

Members: Each campus may have committee

* all recommendations must be approved
by the Presidents Council

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #7 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- Support and enhance ERP infrastructures that will allow for greater centralization;
- Coordinate information technology operations where appropriate;
- Consolidate the systems for shared services (i.e., business services);
- Create a more coordinated approach to human resources; and
- Directly coordinate some of the admissions and financial aid, bursar, and loan collections processing systems.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #7 Committee should focus on three major areas:

- System-wide Services: assessing/centralizing services, where appropriate, in four major areas:
 - student administrative
 - developing and maximizing the use of integrated technology systems
 - business services
 - human resource services
- Workforce Management: retraining and re-deploying employees to higher priority positions within the workforce, attrition management, retirement incentives, and related programs
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 7 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chair, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the campuses approve/revise their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

December 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full implementation begins

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 8 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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.

Implementation of Strategic Direction 8 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, students, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 8. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: Vice Chancellor Nunez, John Mahon, Richard Randall

Campus Committees

- I. Maine State Consortium
 - University of Maine at Fort Kent
 - University of Maine at Machias
 - University of Maine at Presque Isle
- II. University of Southern Maine/University of Maine at Augusta
- III. University of Maine
- IV. University of Maine at Farmington

System-level Committee (new) Outreach Centers

Chair: Vice Chancellor Nunez (UMS)
Members: President Cynthia Huggins (UMM)
 Joseph Wood (USM)
 Dick Campbell (UMA)
 Josh Nadel (UMA)
 Joanne Yestramski (UMS)
 Christine LeGore (UMA)
 Clare Exner (UMPI)
 James Patterson (UM)
 Sherri Sprangers (UMM)
 Dennis Unger (UC)
 Kathy Kane (UC)
 Carol Wood (UM)
 Gary Johnson (USM)
 Jon Schlenker (UMA)
 Student Board Rep: Ben Meiklejohn (UM)
Staff: Judy Ryan (UMS)

System-level Committee (new) Higher Education Park

Chairs: John Mahon (UM)
 Richard Randall (UMA)
Members: Tracy Gran (UC)
 Don Naber (UC)
 Sherri Stevens (UMA)
 Kathleen Dexter (UMA)
 Dick Campbell (UMA)
 John Mahon (UM)
 Janet Waldren (UMA)
 Robert Dana (UM)
 Robert White (UM)
 Dick Randall (UM)
 John Rohman (WBRC Architects)
 Patrick O'Shaughnessy (UM)
 Leonard Kaye (UM)
 Student Board Rep: Leah Malave
 Ray Albert (UMFK)
 Joyce Hedlund (MCCS, EMCS)
 Casey Harris (UMS)
 Alfred Leick (UM)
 Gillian Jordan (UC)
 Ann Blanke (UMA)
Staff: Judy Ryan (UMS)
 Evelyn Silver (UM)
 Joyce Garrand (UMA)

University of Maine Campus Committee

Chair: John Mahon (UM)
Members: Jim Patterson (UM)
 Carol Wood (UM)
 Leonard Kaye (UM)

II. GOALS

The Strategy #8 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- **Simplify and rationalize the System and free up resources.** Institutions should have a clear mandate and mission, to ensure that each can thrive and succeed. A clearer mission and in some cases a defined academic emphasis or niche for each institution will free up resources and position each for success in meeting Maine's educational needs. Without redeployment of resources and additional resources to accomplish the Strategic Plan, the System will not move toward the preferred future state.
- **Enhance students' educational experience.** At the heart of this strategic direction is a commitment to expand and improve educational opportunities for students. By restructuring the System and better defining each institution's mission and niche, it will be easier for students make choices about the type of institution that will best meet their needs. Furthermore, by facilitating collaboration between and among institutions, students will have access to greater academic offerings, including expanded graduate programs.
- **Build on strengths.** This Strategic Plan is designed to leverage the strengths of the System, building on the reputation and presence of the University of Maine, the breadth of its academic and outreach programs, and its strengths in research; enhancing the potential of University of Southern Maine, positioned with strong creative programs and research relevant to the growing southern Maine region; and capitalizing on University of Maine at Farmington's reputation as a successful public liberal arts college. In the case of the smaller institutions, the Strategic Plan addresses the best ways to leverage their strengths in rural studies, North American French studies, Downeast Coastal studies, and Adventure-based education, while at the same time addressing how their functions may be carried out more effectively and efficiently.
- **Utilize resources most effectively and efficiently.** Each institution's mission should be pursued in a way that ensures the best use of resources, both internally and throughout the System. This will allow the System as a whole to run more effectively and efficiently. All institutions, but particularly the University of Maine and the University of Southern Maine, will work closely with the UMS office to make resource decisions more strategic and focused, to identify opportunities for eliminating unnecessary duplication, and to creatively transform their institutions over the next several years.
- **Create a sustainable financial paradigm.** The basic financial paradigm should be mission-driven. Each institution should have a clearly defined mission and its success and resource allocation should be evaluated relative to its ability to fulfill its mission. A mission-driven paradigm is in contrast to one in which resources are allocated based on size or growth. This Strategic Plan encourages institutions to focus on mission rather than growth.

(continued next page)

- **Enhance revenue generation.** Although much of the emphasis is on achieving efficiencies, there are also opportunities for enhancing revenues through such approaches as strengthened private fundraising, national fundraising in key areas of research or unique programs, selective tuition adjustments, more aggressive recruiting, and improved retention as the new organization is better able to meet student needs. The UMS will continue to seek increased appropriations from the State to ensure the fulfillment of the mission of each of its universities.

- **Clarify decision-making parameters.** Closely related to accountability, the Chancellor and Board of Trustees must clarify and inform its stakeholders about the decision-making paradigm that ensures appropriate levels of autonomy and centralization.

- **Link planning and budgeting.** The System Office and each individual institution must be tied to the Strategic Plan. Each institution will write a campus-based strategic plan that must include the strategic directions outlined in the UMS Strategic Plan, and its priorities must be those of the University of Maine System. These strategic plans will be subject to Board approval.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #8 Committee should focus on four major areas:

- **Restructure and Transform:** define missions and niches; reduce duplication; restructure institutions
- **Collaboration:** facilitate new alliances; integrate new programming across the System
- **Workforce Management:** retraining and re-deploying employees to higher priority positions within the workforce, attrition management, retirement incentives, and related programs
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 8 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chair, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings relating to 1) the Merger and Consortium, 2) the Higher Education Park, 3) Outreach Centers, 4) The University of Maine, and 5) the University of Maine at Farmington should be planned around the following deadlines, respectively:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

I. Merger and Consortium:

June 2005: Committee submits preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

Summer 2005: Administrative Merger and Consortium take effect

↓

December 2005: Committee submits recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

June 2006: Committee submits final recommendations to the Chancellor

II. Higher Education Park:

June 2005: Committee submits preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committee submits revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revise recommendations

↓

January 2006: Implementation begins

↓

June 2006: Committee submits recommendations to the Chancellor

III. Outreach Centers:

May 2005: Committee submits preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committee submits revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revise recommendations

↓

January 2006: Implementation begins

↓

June 2006: Committee submits recommendations to the Chancellor

IV. The University of Maine:

May 2005: Committee submits preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

December 2005: Committee submits recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revise recommendations

↓

May 2006: Committee submits final recommendations to the Chancellor

V. University of Maine at Farmington:

May 2005: Committee submits preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

December 2005: Committee submits recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revise recommendations

↓

May 2006: Committee submits final recommendations to the Chancellor

STRATEGIC DIRECTION 9 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING PROCESS

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

Implementation of Strategic Direction 9 will require the collaborative efforts of committee members, faculty, and staff across the System. Following the “Guiding Principles” for the Implementation Planning process, committees on both the System and campus levels will work together to implement and integrate the goals of Strategic Direction 9. Below is an outline for this important work. It includes committee structure, overarching goals, approaches, expected outcomes, and timeline.

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Coordinating Chairs: President Robert Kennedy
President Richard Cost

System-level Committee (new)

<i>Chairs:</i>	Chancellor Joseph Westphal (UMS) President Richard Cost(UMS)
<i>Members:</i>	Maine Education Association (MEA) Faculty Board Rep: Carol Kontos (UMA) Elizabeth Shorr (USM) Joe Carr (UM) Jane Russo (UMA) Bill Geller (UMF) Bob Caswell (USM) Donna Thornton (UM) Erin Benson (UMPI) Jason Parent (UMFK) Sheri Fraser (UMA) Judy Horan (WLBZ-TV) Mark Gray (MEA) John Reisman (UMM) Julianna Acheson (UMF) E. Scott Harris (USM) Joseph Becker (UMFK) Chet Rock (UM) Leo Saucier (UMPI) Student Board Rep: Adam Boucher (UMM)
<i>Staff:</i>	John Diamond (UMS)

bold indicates primary level

II. GOALS

The Strategy #9 Committee's goals, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, are to:

- Commission and coordinate market and opinion research to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the universities' student recruitment and relationship-building activities.
- Collaborate with each university to identify ways and resources to strengthen their fund-raising ability, planning, and levels of success.
- Negotiate group purchases, contracts, productions, and services that could reduce each university's cost of time, labor, and materials used in a broad array of advancement and advocacy activities.
- Develop and coordinate, at the SWS level, in-state and out-of-state marketing strategies that promote enrollment and support for Maine's public universities and which complement the marketing strategies of the individual universities. Develop print, electronic, and digital resources and software tools for universities to customize for their purposes to communicate with their key constituencies and audiences.

III. APPROACHES

In order to achieve these objectives, the Strategy #9 Committee should focus on four major areas:

- Advocacy: marketing initiatives that distinguish and promote University System institutions; improved relations with business communities
- Student Relations: connecting universities to potential students in and out-of-State; relationship-building and collaborative efforts with K-12
- Strategic Investment Initiative
- Other areas may be identified as work progresses

IV. OUTCOMES

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of implementation planning, it is necessary to employ an action-oriented and results-focused methodology for committee work. This methodology, called SMART, will lead to coherent, focused, effective outcomes. SMART is an acronym for the common characteristics of obtainable objectives. They are: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive-Achievable-Agreed to, Reasonable, and Time-bound.

V. Timeline

Over the next year and a half, the committees for implementation of Strategic Direction 9 will be responsible, through their Coordinating Chairs, for submitting recommendations to the Chancellor for review. After the Chancellor approves/revises their recommendations, the committees will work on the next phase of Implementation Planning. These recommendations should include a report on the progress made to date and outline the goals for next steps, including methods for achieving those goals and assessing their outcomes. Prior to reporting to the Chancellor, committees should present their recommendations to administration, faculty, students, or other interested campus constituents for review. Committee meetings should be planned around the following deadlines:

Each set of Committee recommendations will be posted on the Web for comment. A deadline will be indicated for submission of those comments.

May 2005: Committees submit preliminary recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

November 2005: Committees submit revised recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

April 2006: Committees submit final recommendations to the Chancellor

↓

Chancellor approves/revises recommendations

↓

May 2006: Full Implementation begins