



Office of the Chancellor
15 Eslabrooke Drive
Orono, ME 04469

Tel: 207-973-3205
www.maine.edu

16 March 2018

The University of Maine

Dr. Barbara E. Brittingham
President, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100
Burlington, MA 01803-4514

University of Maine
at Augusta

Dear President Brittingham:

University of Maine
at Farmington

In its letter of 24 August 2017 to my office, the Commission requested a spring 2018 update on the University of Maine System's One University initiative, with a particular focus on financial organization and multi-campus programs. This update follows. Please let me know what further information the Commission may want or find useful, and we stand ready to discuss any aspect of this initiative at the Commission's convenience.

University of Maine
at Fort Kent

University of Maine
at Machias

Respectfully submitted,

University of Maine
at Presque Isle

University of
Southern Maine

James H. Page, Ph. D.
Chancellor

cc: Dr. Robert Neely, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UMS
Ryan Low, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, UMS
James Thelen, J.D., Chief of Staff and General Counsel, UMS
Rosa Redonnet, Chief Student Affairs Officer, UMS
Dr. Susan Hunter, President, UM/UMM
Dr. Rebecca Wyke, President, UMA
Or. Kathryn Foster, President, UMF
Dr. John Short, President, UMFK
Dr. Raymond Rice, President, UMPI
Dr. Glenn Cummings, President, USM

In its letter of 24 August 2017 to my office, the Commission requested a spring 2018 update on the University of Maine System's One University initiative, with a particular focus on financial organization and multi-campus programs. These items follow. To begin, however, I offer a brief, high-level review of our One University initiative.

The University of Maine System (UMS) is responsible to serve the people of Maine through education, research, and public service. Maine's challenges are well-known. In the next 15 years Maine's working age population will drop 15%, from a little over 700,000 to 600,000. There is already a significant shortage in many professions (e.g., nursing, engineering, the computer sciences) that will extend to nearly every professional area and become demonstrably more acute in the coming five to ten years. During this same period, roughly 67% of new Maine jobs will require some form of post-secondary education when presently that attainment rate is under 42%. This combination of state demographics and the rapidly changing nature of the workforce speaks to the critical role UMS has in Maine's economic and social future.

Recognizing its role and responsibility, the UMS Board of Trustees have set four strategic priorities embedded in the One University framework by which UMS organizes and acts so as to bring all its resources into focused support for all Maine families, businesses, and communities. These four priority outcomes are:

- Enrollment. Bring more people to higher education.
- Student Success. Ensure that once enrolled, students are retained, graduate with as low a debt as possible, and are well-prepared for careers or additional graduate and professional training.
- Research and Economic Development. Increase basic and applied research, expert consulting, and workforce training tied to advancing Maine businesses and communities.
- Fiscal Sustainability. Ensure UMS is positioned and managed in a financially responsible and sustainable way, with no long-term structural budget deficit and with sufficient resources to meet its educational, research, and service responsibilities.

Each of these first three priority outcomes is measured by external key performance indicators reflecting student and state success. The fourth is measured by accepted national standards of institutional viability.

Reflecting the One University approach, UMS continues to organize using four strategic integration guidelines first adopted in 2014 with slight subsequent modifications. These are:

- Create a unified financial management structure that enables long-term, comprehensive strategic planning and resource allocation and that underwrites those reforms required to eliminate structural budget gaps and deficits.
- Integrate administrative functions for optimal service and efficiency.
- Develop inter-campus positioning and branding that together best serves Maine students and best meets community, regional, and state needs.
- Develop inter-campus academic collaborations to create an integrated portfolio of programs and services that best serves Maine students, employers, and businesses.

The first two guidelines are in place and operational. The latter two are in development or implementation.

In addition to finance and academic programming, two current inter-campus collaborations are worth noting in this context. First, the partnership under which the University of Maine at Machias (UMM) has

become a regional campus of the University of Maine is in its first year of full implementation. Collaboration is strong and campus/community commitment is undiminished. One collaborative example is the addition of three UMM representatives to the UMaine presidential search committee. Second, the University of Maine Presque Isle / University of Maine Ft. Kent collaboration continues to develop, with emphases on enrollment strategies, shared programs (further referenced in the section below on multi-campus programs), and administrative efficiencies. Although this collaboration is less formal than the UMaine/Machias partnership, it represents important formative steps in positioning both institutions to better serve their students and region.

With respect to future System direction, as profiled in a recent *Chronical* article, a copy of which is included in this report, we continue to pursue a middle path between the old, federated system model and complete structural unification represented informally as “single accreditation”. As I have previously reported to the Commission, should the reforms, changes, and investments we believe are necessary to achieve our priority student and state outcomes not be achievable pursuing this middle path, it is likely UMS will turn more aggressively towards structural unification. Yet the risks and challenges of moving in that direction are substantial and could severely compromise UMS’s priority outcomes at a time when Maine must make progress in those directions. Structure must continue to adapt to strategy.

Comprehensive Financial Management Summary

Introduction: As the Commission is aware, in November 2014 the Board of Trustees revised its policy governing the development and management of operating and capital budgets to align more closely with existing Maine law and Board policy. At the same time, the Board instructed the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to develop a comprehensive financial management structure reflecting unified finance and administrative services that are functionally aligned. In July 2016 the University of Maine System reorganized existing staff to create a Chief Financial Officer who was given the responsibility to develop a unified operating budget and financial oversight of the entire enterprise, including finance staff on each of the campuses. All finance staff continued to be located at campus locations – no campus staff were relocated as part of the reorganization. At the same time the Board called for each of the Chief Business Officers at our campuses to be jointly selected and evaluated by the Chief Financial Officer and campus president. A solid line reporting relationship was created to the CFO with a dotted line relationship back to their campus president.

March 2017 response to the Commission / Aims McGuinness’s memo: Last year, UMS provided a substantial written update to the Commission on the financial reorganization as well as appearing at the Commission’s meeting in York Harbor, Maine to discuss these changes. That update detailed the early results of the new structure, as well as addressing the points raised in the Aims McGuinness April 2017 memo. As we noted at the time, it is our position that the results of the financial changes implemented over the past 24-36 months have been extremely successful. Specific examples of some of those early success stories were included in our 2017 update. As we noted then, Aims accurately captured the relationship that exists between the CFO and each of the Chief Business Officers, as well as the relationships they each share with their respective campus president. Ultimately, Aims concluded that the job descriptions and their “dotted line” relationship was potentially out of compliance with NEASC Standards (e.g., Standards 3) and offered suggestions to address concerns raised by the Commission. Late last year Chancellor Page organized a discussion at President’s Council specific to the Aims memo. Although there continues to be strong support for the current structure and reporting relationships, the

Chancellor and President's Council unanimously agreed to thoroughly review the comments suggested by Aims and to consider possible changes to reporting relationships.

March 2018 update – Structure: Since the 2017 update, UMS has had two organizational changes that have modestly changed the structure of our finance operations. Both became effective in July 2017. The first change was the Board's decision to make the University of Maine at Machias (UMM) a regional campus of the University of Maine (UM). As part of that reorganization, the Chief Business Officer at the University of Maine effectively became the Chief Business Officer for both campuses. A budget analyst was hired to support UMM's day-to-day operations with that individual reporting to the CBO for broader direction and mentoring.

In addition to the changes in relationship between UM and UMM, Chancellor Page made the decision in July 2017 to combine the positions of Chief Financial Officer and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Prior to the Chancellor's actions, the CFO reported directly to the Vice Chancellor. While the latter change did not impact the job description or reporting relationships with the Chief Business Officers, it has improved the overall functionality of the group. As noted in our previous update, the Chief Business Officers meet as a group on weekly basis via technology. In July we expanded our weekly meetings to include other key enterprise wide leaders, including the Chief Human Resource Office, the Chief Information Office and the Chief Facilities Director. This new structure allows our campus finance leaders literally to be at the table for conversations that previously took place with little or no input with them. It allows CBOs to meet with HR when we discuss health insurance or benefit changes; for CBOs to participate in discussions about the shared service charges; as well fully engaging with other enterprise-wide administrative leaders as key decisions are made.

March 2018 update – Reporting relationships: The System leadership team including the Presidents have held numerous discussions since last year about reporting line relationships. As we noted in March 2017, our experience with the University of Maine System over the first few years of this new structure is that it is largely in alignment with the suggestions offered in the Aims McGuinness memo. We concur that the President is and has been responsible for the development of the campus budget and also agree the President is ultimately responsible for managing the approved budget. Our experiences since last year continue to support that conclusion. Despite the lines on the organization chart, the structure has effectively operated in a dual reporting manner since 2016. In addition to the reference above to the development of the campus budget, Presidents also participate in the annual review of each of the Chief Business Officers and actively manage the hiring process for any new Chief Business Officer. We are currently in the middle of our second search process for a CBO since moving to this new reporting relationship. In both cases, the search process was a joint process involving the Vice Chancellor and the campus. The Vice Chancellor coordinates the details with the President, including the timing of the search and the makeup of the search committee. Interviews are set up at the campus and the applicant pool is eventually narrowed down to a small pool of finalists. All finalists are then interviewed by both the President and the Vice Chancellor before a final selection is made.

While UMS plans to move to a dual reporting relationship to satisfy the concerns expressed by the Commission, we want to do so in a deliberate manner that stays consistent with the Board of Trustee's original charge. Managing in a matrix environment is not something that is yet common in higher education, and we are reluctant to "flip the switch" suddenly and without careful consideration of how the changes will impact current processes and relationships. To that end, the Chancellor and Presidents Council will be participating in a half day training later this month titled "Working in a Matrix

Environment.” The objective of the training will be to understand the benefits and risks inherent in a matrix structure and the skillsets it takes to maximize success in that structure. Following this training, the Chancellor and Presidents will seek input from the Board of Trustees to ensure alignment. In addition, we will be ready to make adjustments to job descriptions should we receive support from the Board. The goal is to complete these steps in time for the reporting relations to be amended effective by the beginning of the next fiscal year (July 1, 2018).

Multi-campus Programs

Introduction: In the 2017 report to CIHE, UMS described the history and recent initiatives to develop multi-campus programs and other academic collaborations among the seven campuses in accordance with the UMS “One University” philosophy. Multi-campus programming in an economically-depressed state with demographic challenges, as well as a place-bound, poorly-educated population, has the potential to elevate the entire UMS enterprise through development of efficiencies and shared values in support of academic excellence. From a UMS perspective, multi-campus programs are expected to:

- maximize program access for Maine citizens for whom relocation for educational purposes is not an option;
- maximize efficient use of financial and human resources;
- maximize faculty expertise across multiple campuses;
- maximize the affordability of public higher education in Maine;
- maximize shared branding and marketing opportunities within the UMS;
- maximize overall academic quality across the UMS.

As UMS continues to work toward more multi-campus programming, as emphasized in the 2017 report we are committed to full cooperation and ongoing communication with CIHE to meet all accreditation standards. As the UMS experiments with the development of a coherent strategy for multi-campus academic programming, we also remain firmly focused on the areas to which CIHE attention has been drawn regarding matters of accountability, academic governance, autonomy, and quality.

UMS efforts to advance multi-campus programming and other important academic alignments were described in the 2017 report to CIHE under the label of “Academic Transformation,” which generally encapsulates all efforts necessary for fostering effective academic interactions among UMS campuses. Two elements within the Academic Transformation initiative as described to CIHE in the 2017 report included strategies related to advancing multi-campus (1) *academic programming* and (2) *administrative efforts* underway to address various barriers impeding multi-campus programming. Although the UMS landscape around academic transformation is evolving continuously, the organization of this report again is framed around initiatives related to programming and administration.

Academic Programming

A. Program Integration - Program Innovation Fund: In general, two primary strategies to engage faculty in the development of multi-campus programs have been employed, the first of which was the *Academic Portfolio Review and Integration Process* beginning in 2015. This process eventually resulted in the formalization of 16 academic program integration teams (Table 1). As noted below, the role of the program integration teams has been scaled back temporarily, with a more prominent focus now on a

second strategy of fostering collaboration through the recently-established *Program Innovation Fund*, in which faculty have been invited to submit funding requests for multi-campus programming.

Table 1. Academic Program Integration Teams – academic program integration teams convened during the 2016 – 2017 academic year in 16 disciplines:

1. Mathematics	7. Education	13. Physics
2. Languages	8. Business	14. Marine Science
3. Engineering	9. History	15. Chemistry
4. Psychology	10. Biology	16. Criminal Justice
5. English	11. Recreation/Tourism	
6. Nursing	12. Social Work	

On the basis of the review of the 2017 annual progress reports from the academic program integration teams, the UMS Council of Chief Academic Officers decided that nine of the teams would be placed on recess, pending resolution of various administrative barriers facing multi-campus programming (see section regarding Administrative Efforts below). For Teams 1 – 7 (Table 1), discussions regarding collaboration remain active, either because of various initiatives underway and/or the positive nature of the team member’s interactions and collaborative spirit. The remaining teams have been models of positivity regarding interactions and shared goals, such as alignment of student learning outcomes or specific multi-campus programming efforts (e.g., 1+3 pre-engineering program between the College of Engineering at the University of Maine and other UMS campuses, and the Nursing Outreach to Rural Maine (NORM) program involving the School of Nursing at the University of Maine and the University of Maine at Machias).

Over the past two years, the focus has shifted from the academic program integration teams to the Program Innovation Fund strategy as a mechanism for incentivizing, through a competitive proposal process, any group of faculty to offer ideas for multi-campus programming. Program Innovation Fund proposals are evaluated by the UMS Chief Academic Officers Council (CAOC). Please refer to Attachment #1, which provides the Fall 2017 guidelines for the Program Innovation Fund request for proposals. For the original Fall 2016 launch of the PIF initiative, the primary evaluation criteria included strength of a multi-campus collaboration, ability to bring about enrollment growth, development of new graduate programming, addressing a Maine workforce need, and incorporating technological innovation. For 2017-2018, one new criterion of “career readiness” was also added to the PIF expectations.

As detailed in the 2017 UMS report to CIHE, 17 Program Innovation Fund proposals were submitted by faculty and evaluated by the CAOC in the first year of the PIF process, with eight proposals recommended for support. In that first year, substantial overlap existed between work of some of the program integrations teams and successful Program Innovation Fund projects, i.e., the work of the Engineering, Nursing, Education, and English program integration teams morphed into successful Program Innovation Fund proposals.

The 2018 Program Innovation Fund call for proposals was modified from the fledgling effort in 2017 to include a pre-proposal screening process in the second year of the Fund. As a result, 43 faculty-generated Program Innovation Fund pre-proposals were received and evaluated by the CAOC in November, 2017. Of those pre-proposals, the CAOC invited 21 to the full-proposal stage. Those proposals are due March

23, 2018 and will be reviewed by the CAOC in time to announce the successful proposals before the end of the 2018 Spring semester (May, 2018).

B. Programs for Examination: In 2017, an annual Programs for Examination process was developed by the CAOC and endorsed by the UMS Board of Trustees (BOT). The Programs for Examination process established programmatic thresholds regarding the number of graduates produced per year in a program (3-year rolling average), number of majors in a program (3-year rolling average), and number of faculty supporting a program. Details regarding the Programs for Examination process are further explained in Attachment #2, and the first analysis of the examination data are summarized by UMS campus in Table 2.

Table 2. 2017 analysis of the UMS program inventory in relation to the programs for examination criteria. Values represent the % of programs failing to meet at least one criterion.

	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
University of Maine at Augusta	14%	N/A	N/A
University of Maine at Farmington	49%	0%	N/A
University of Maine at Fort Kent	52%	N/A	N/A
University of Maine at Machias	42%	N/A	N/A
University of Maine	21%	45%	33%
University of Maine at Presque Isle	55%	N/A	N/A
University of Southern Maine	20%	25%	25%

NOTES: Bachelors criteria = fewer than 15 majors, or fewer than five degrees conferred per year; master’s criteria = fewer than three degrees conferred per year; doctoral criteria = fewer than two degrees conferred per year. All criteria are determined on the basis of three year rolling averages (2014 – 2017).

Given the percentages in Table 2, it is important to note that programs may not meet one of the criteria but be perfectly healthy; e.g., programs offering service courses may produce a substantial number of credit hours, but perhaps not meet the criterion for number of majors. Thus, the Programs for Examination process is not intended for any “strict” interpretation of program viability. Rather, this new examination process has a twofold purpose to: (a) prompt an annual discussion – and ongoing understanding - of programmatic contributions and needs; and, (b) help in the identification of specific programs in common across multiple campuses that might be candidates for collaborative programming because of low enrollment or staffing levels.

C. Academic Partnership between the University of Maine at Fort Kent (UMFK) and the University of Maine at Presque Isle (UMPI): In 2017, we reported to CIHE the appointment of an interim Executive Vice President for Collaboration and Strategic Alliances between UMFK and UMPI as well as plans for a steering committee to study and recommend possibilities for academic collaboration between the two institutions. Two areas have emerged for collaboration: (1) pending suspension of the Education program on the UMFK campus, but with delivery to UMFK students by UMPI, and (2) an emerging collaboration for UMFK delivery of an undergraduate nursing program to UMPI, including Northern Maine Community College as a partner. The two developments, however, came about more as a result of happenstance than careful planning, and deliberations between UMPI-UMFK have not progressed substantially since the 2017 UMS report to CIHE. The slow pace of interaction between the two campuses, coupled with CIHE concerns, resulted in candid discussions of the UMFK-UMPI situation(s) at the 2017 annual CIHE conference among participants that included UMS, UMPI, UMFK and CIHE personnel. Eventually, other internal UMS discussions culminated in a memo from the UMS Vice

Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) to the two campus Presidents/Provosts detailing expectations for a more proactive planning process to explore academic collaborations (see Attachment #3). The Programs for Examination process, discussed in the previous section, has been one tactic in identifying potential academic disciplines for shared programming between UMFK and UMPI.

D. Shared, online master's degree programs: In November, 2017 a joint meeting of the UMS Presidents and Chief Academic Officers (Provosts) was convened to evaluate the possibility of a small number of master's programs that could be delivered collaboratively in an online, multi-campus format throughout the state to meet educational needs, particularly for working adults. The Presidents and Provosts were supportive, and a list of 30 graduate programs was initially generated, of which the following six disciplinary areas were targeted for immediate exploration: Nursing, Cybersecurity, Criminal Justice, Education, Emergency Management and Athletic Training.

The six possibilities for master's programs are currently at various stages of planning and coordination with the seven campuses. For example, according to the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE), athletic training will no longer be a bachelor's degree accredited program, but will require a master's degree for a career in the field. As a result, UMaine and UMPI were in a similar situation of considering the phase-out of their undergraduate program in athletic training prior to the discussion about collaborative master's programs. Simultaneously, USM had hired a new director of their athletic training program to build a curriculum within the new accreditation requirements. As a result of these developments, the current plan for the athletic training degree is to coordinate now the efforts of the three campuses, to have each campus maintain its undergraduate degree programs, and to contribute to a master's degree program in which the participating universities have agreed that USM would confer and oversee the degree. The final proposed plan includes strategies for 3+2 and 4+1 accelerated programs for students in this collaborative online master's degree.

As one might imagine, the possibility of a suite of collaborative online master's programs spurred considerable discussion among the Presidents and Provosts, particularly regarding mission differentiation among campuses, mechanisms for shared, multi-campus program delivery, and accreditation implications, etc. The ability of campuses to provide sufficient technical, administrative, and curriculum support for online delivery of courses is an area to be addressed, particularly in those instances where faculty have little experience with online instruction. One strategy being considered by the UMS for providing such support is through a partnership with an online management provider. The purpose of an online management provider would be to provide market research and marketing services, as well as technical, administrative and curricular advice and support where needed.

E. Geospatial Technology: Faculty from each of the seven UMS campuses with advocacy from the UMS Chancellor's office collectively proposed the formation of the Maine Geospatial Institute. Drawing on the resources of the seven campuses, the faculty have proposed to create a statewide Geospatial Institute to support geospatial education and research, workforce development, and economic growth. From the perspective of the faculty, this endeavor "represents a unique opportunity to create a collaborative structure within the state's university system under the aegis of the "One University" initiative with expanded links to industry, government, NGO and community partners." The Institute has two primary goals:

- to provide a statewide infrastructure for integrating geospatial education from K-12 to post-graduate and continuing education with geospatial research and technology development. It will bridge the "digital divide" that currently separates the state's well-

served urbanized regions from under-served rural regions, expanding access to educational resources statewide.

- to link the education and research sector to industry, facilitating technology transfer, project collaboration, and research and development partnerships.

The Maine Geospatial Institute has financial support from the UMS and will have a physical presence on each of the seven UMS campuses through satellite Project Centers coordinated by a Main Project Center. The Centers will provide venues for research and education in geospatial science, including a collaborative partnership model with industries, agencies, and communities.

F. Online Programming – In FY17, UMS generated 137,320 student credit hours (SCH) through online programming, which represented 20.1% of the total UMS billed SCH (655,997 SCH). Approximately 89% of those online SCH were delivered to Maine residents, with a significant percentage of distance education courses enrolled by baccalaureate students (78.4%). The percentage of SCH delivered in an online format varied substantially among the UMS campuses, ranging from >50% of total SCH (UMA) to less than 1% of total SCH (UMF).

Opinions vary across the UMS campuses regarding questions about target online SCH, appropriate percentages of online SCH relative to total SCH, intended student audiences for online programming, etc. At the System level, however, particularly given the demographics and educational needs of the state, the data suggest the need and potential for more online programming. Even the vast disparity in the magnitude of online programming on individual UMS campuses suggests the need for a more coherent strategy. As early as 2015, UMS produced a report entitled “Unified Online” for full UMS collaboration and centralization of online programming to leverage resources, foster a student-centered approach, and develop a center for excellence in digitally-enhanced teaching and learning. The report went as far as suggesting a new UMS position and governance structure to oversee a unified platform and approach to online distance education. In summary, the report was not well received among the campuses. Faculty Senates and academic administrators (e.g., Dean’s Council) alike objected to the proposed direction. Implementation of the Unified Online plan has not been attempted; rather, a two-prong approach has been taken of working organically to promote increased online programming and quality within the context of One University and exploring the possibility of the UMS partnering with an online management provider for a few strategic programs.

Within the framework of One University, multi-campus programming is predicated on an online modality for providing access to all required coursework in such programs across participating campuses; thus, online programming is inherent in the UMS strategy for collaboration. In fact, two of the successful Program Innovation Fund proposals from 2017 were specifically intended to convert faculty-identified, face-to-face courses/programs into an online format (e.g., health programs, particularly data science and health management information systems). Similarly, the initiative discussed under item “D” above regarding shared, online master’s programs not only dovetails with multi-campus programming under the One University philosophy, but simultaneously addresses needs related to adult workforce development in Maine.

The idea of working with an online manage provider is also in its early stages, with a goal of expanding access to public, post-secondary education in Maine to critical markets inside and outside the state – particularly in key workforce areas. No decision has been made to utilize a provider, but feedback from all campuses as a result of recent presentations by two such providers suggests an interest in further

exploration of this strategy -- committee recommendations to the Presidents Council and the CAOC are pending. If the UMS were to decide to pursue an arrangement with an online management provider, we do not envision more than 2 – 3 programs being offered in such a partnership. At this point, program possibilities thus far mentioned at a superficial level - with no input or consensus across the campuses – include the Doctor of Nursing Practice, the RN to BSN bachelor’s degree, a bachelor’s or master’s degrees in cybersecurity, a master of education in teaching, or the MBA. We anticipate about another two months of campus discussions before reaching a decision point about working with a provider.

Administrative Efforts to Facilitate Multi-campus Programming

A. Administrative Program Integration Teams: The 2017 UMS report to CIHE described the expansion of the Academic Transformation initiative to begin to address administrative barriers, governance issues, and accreditation concerns (both institutional and disciplinary) facing multi-campus collaborations. A preliminary list of barriers to collaboration needing solutions (Attachment #4) was generated in the early stages of One University and program integration initiatives. Thus, in 2017, three “administrative” program integration teams were formed to deal with: (a) financial issues, (b) student issues, and (c) library resources. Collectively, these three administrative program integration teams included CAOs, Registrars, Bursars, Librarians, Chief Business Officers, Financial Aid Administrators, IT personnel, UMS staff and other key campus representatives.

Ultimately, because solutions to some of the financial problems and student issues were tied to existing technological solutions, the financial and student administrative teams were merged (see discussion of course cross-listing below). The administrative program integration team regarding library resources was charged with a more straightforward task of determining the funding needed to make all library holdings equally available throughout the UMS. The library team completed their work in Fall, 2017, with a preliminary determination that approximately \$5.4M in ongoing funding would be required for shared library holdings. The UMS is currently collaborating with the Maine State Library in a procurement effort to determine if savings could be realized through joint licensing/purchasing with the State of library materials.

G. Course Cross-listing

i. Cross-listing Methodology and Ramifications

With the merging of the financial and student administrative program integration teams into a single group, a strategy has emerged to cross-list any shared courses in the catalogs of campuses partners. Such models are not uncommon and are being studied for applicability in Maine. Approaches range from policies regarding cross-registration, which are still cumbersome for students (e.g., SUNY – Attachment #5) to course cross-listing approaches that simplify matters for student participation in multi-campus programs (e.g., North Texas Federation of Universities – Attachment #6). Other examples of course sharing among CIHE universities include Wellesley College, Babson College, Olin College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, etc. – see following links:

- Babson College <https://tinyurl.com/y8wzvtna>
- Wellesley College <https://tinyurl.com/ydb6lgc8>
- Olin College <https://tinyurl.com/y8suuqpv>
- Brandeis University <https://tinyurl.com/y7wd4xuy>

Of these examples, only the North Texas Federation represents a comprehensive cross-registration model in a multi-campus collaboration for delivery of a program. The other examples for cross-registration, which probably serve mostly to provide students flexibility and access to various electives that might otherwise be unavailable, still provide insight into administering academic offerings involving more than one institution.

Although the UMS is in the early stages of attempting to pilot course cross-listing, we imagine that collaborative agreements among institutions could include sharing an entire program, a collection of courses, or a single course section, all of which follow the same process. A central premise to the UMS approach to course cross-listing is identification of a Host institution that provides instruction for another university representing a student's Home institution. At the institutional level, cross-listing provides institutions with a mechanism to create innovative new programs that the Home institution could not create individually and to deploy faculty and other resources more efficiently. For students, cross-listing provides a seamless student experience for registration, financial aid, billing, and degree planning. Course cross-listing can also enrich a student's academic program by making available courses not taught by the Home institution, or perhaps help resolve course scheduling issues that could potentially impact timely graduation.

Attachment #7 details an evolving, working document to codify a cross-listing strategy for use in UMS, cross-referenced with existing UMS Board of Trustees Policies. In summary, however, cross-listing involves the following steps:

1. Cross-listing is initiated by faculty from the participating academic units/programs approving, through normal curricular approval processes, those courses appropriate for cross-listing in a shared program. Such approval would be subjected to subsequent evaluation by academic administrators and faculty groups (e.g., Faculty Senate or University Curriculum Committees), including review by the UMS Chief Academic Officers Council and UMS administrative officers.
2. Upon academic approval (which could include approval at System and Board of Trustees level for any new or newly delivered multi-campus programs), all other appropriate administrative offices would be notified in writing of courses approved for cross-listing. Courses catalog and enrollment processes would be updated as appropriate.
3. Courses would be tagged in the UMS information systems as cross-listed, which ultimately would automate the distribution of a tuition revenue sharing model. The UMS has developed a model for distribution of tuition differentiated on campuses delivering courses to other campuses, tracked by student enrollment by course from each campus. As a pilot project, course cross-listing and the accompanying financial model are being investigated for an existing, long-standing program in which a course is already required by one UMS campus, but delivered by another UMS campus.

Course cross-listing is essential for facilitating student participation in courses shared through a multi-campus program. For a student in a multi-campus program, cross-listing essentially treats any course in a collaborative program as "native" credit on a student's home campus because the course, although delivered from another campus, is in the home campus catalog for that student. From the perspective of a campus, administrative obligations of participating in a multi-campus program are also lightened because

the courses for cross-listing have been approved through existing governance processes, the courses have been appropriately tagged in UMS enterprise resource planning management systems, and financial processes related revenue distribution have been automated.

We understand that CIHE will have concerns regarding course cross-listing with respect to specific standards, if not general questions related to institutional accreditation and oversight of programs. However, such concerns and questions undoubtedly would be manifest in any approach to oversight of multi-campus programming, with or without a strategy of course cross-listing. Given the advantages of cross-listing from a student and institutional perspective, we see the cross-listing strategy as a viable and easily-managed approach that could be considered from the following two perspectives.

From one perspective, course cross-listing is merely a mechanism that enables students to enrich their educational experience by having access to appropriately-approved courses on other campuses, but not as a component of a multi-campus program. Essentially, this is resource sharing, which, in some ways, is analogous to (a) having an adjunct faculty member teach a course at a remote site for a campus; but, in this case a UMS faculty member from another UMS campus is teaching the course, perhaps with students from more than one campus enrolled in that course; (b) a student transferring a course from another institution, without actually having to go through a transfer process; and (c) a program within an institution relying on courses from other departments, i.e., program control still rests with the home department. Thus, cross-listing represents a straightforward way to share and make courses available to students. The net result is that a student does not have to be admitted at more than one campus, they do not need to transfer a completed course, and the details of financial aid are simplified for the student.

The larger problem arises from the second perspective in which course cross-listing is used to deliver a multi-campus degree program across multiple campuses, which then raises questions of academic/institutional control and the need for special accommodation for academic governance. The UMS is critically cognizant of CIHE expectations regarding appropriate academic governance of multi-campus programs. To help with future communication both to CIHE and among the UMS campuses, one major task being undertaken across all of the UMS groups and teams mentioned in this report, as well as others, is the development of detailed documentation for multi-campus programs, i.e., guidelines for the development and ongoing oversight of multi-campus programs. Attachment #7 regarding the course cross-listing methodology is an example of the development of such documentation that is in its early stages, but that ultimately will be integrated into policies and procedures for *Administration of Multiple-Campus Degree Programs*.

In addition to establishing guidelines for the collaborative academic program review and approval, documentation will include requirements for formulation of program MOUs detailing expectations for program oversight, particularly regarding the resolution of programmatic differences of opinion. As mentioned in the 2017 report:

.... possible models to ensure that the authority for programmatic oversight and assurance of quality rests with the CAOs and their faculty (albeit shared authority) might include:

- identification of a lead CAO for a multi-campus program - likely to be determined on the basis of the magnitude of a campus's role in the program, the number of participating students, size of contributing faculty, or some other appropriate metric.*

- *rotating lead CAO for a multi-campus program – it is not uncommon in U.S. higher education for intra-institutional, interdisciplinary programs to agree to rotate lead departments on a regular, predetermined cycle. A similar possibility might be developed for any multi-campus program.*

- *creation of a dispute resolution committee for a multi-campus program – in anticipation of possible disagreements, participants in a multi-campus program might agree a priori to a dispute resolution process, perhaps through a committee process. Such a committee might not necessarily include on representatives from the programmatic participants.*

In consultation with CIHE and NEASC, the UMS could explore the extent to which any of these strategies, or other approaches, might address the concerns. Should an acceptable understanding be determined, the document on Administration of Multiple-Campus Degree Programs continue to evolve to include specific requirements regarding programmatic autonomy, CAO authority, faculty engagement and academic quality, consistent with CIHE standards and to be used in substantive change submissions.

ii. Cross-listing and Key CIHE Standards

We have appreciated the positive and ongoing discussion with CIHE regarding multi-campus academic programming within UMS and have not lost sight of the standards of importance to CIHE, i.e., 3.14, 4.36, 4.5 and 4.6 (as identified in the 2016 CIHE letter). Of particular concern to CIHE has been the UMS’s ability to adhere to Standards 3.14 and 4.5 regarding lines of authority and oversight for academic matters. Thus, to implement cross-listed course sections in a culture of shared governance, the development of appropriate academic policy and procedural amendments as discussed above is essential to academic oversight processes, faculty management, course management, revenue sharing, Learning Management System administration, student rights and discipline, reporting definitions, etc. In addition, CIHE’s concern that the UMS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs might supplant the authority of the Chief Academic Officers for any multi-campus programs is an issue that we intend to resolve to CIHE’s satisfaction. In combination with the development of guidelines for multi-campus programs and the requirement for detailed MOUs, the identification of “Home” and “Host” institutions in the cross-listing methodology might provide another cornerstone for effectively codifying the understanding of responsibility for program oversight and quality to CIHE’s satisfaction.

In accordance with Standard 4.36, UMS will ensure that students earn a minimum of one fourth of their credits toward graduation at their home campus in a multi-campus program, including substantial advanced work in the major or concentration at the institution awarding the degree. Similarly, in accordance with CIHE Standard 4.6, any multi-campus program will be subject to routine program review – in fact, the new Programs for Examination policy/procedure provides a process for even more attention to program performance.

Lastly, as expected by CIHE, all policy and procedural details for multi-campus academic endeavors will be provided in any request from the UMS to CIHE for a substantive change before implementation of a shared multi-campus program.

B. Development of UMS Institutional Research (IR) Capability: The need for access to integrated data from UMS financial, student and human resource systems across the seven campuses cannot be

overstated. Not only is a UMS IR function essential for System-level understanding and support, ready access to data, reports and dashboards is fulfilling a critical need across the UMS campuses. The new capabilities are providing information fundamental for planning, improvement, and understanding of all aspects of university performance (e.g., see Program for Examination discussion above). Interestingly, the emerging IR capability has been one of the most positively-received UMS initiatives in recent memory, including support from the Board of Trustees, Presidents, campus IR offices, and faculty. In this endeavor, the System added four new FTE in 2017 for IR, and emphasized data governance as a foundation for all effective operations and decisions. The UMS IR team is expanding on existing reporting capability and building models for specific uses (e.g., Early College, Distance Education, enrollment forecasting, etc.). Further, interactive UMS dashboards already have been developed and are constantly evolving (see <https://sites.google.com/maine.edu/umsdashboard/main>) to dovetail with the Board of Trustees Strategic Resource Allocation Plan.

Regarding data governance, the overarching philosophy is that everyone involved in the operation of our universities has a role in data governance, beginning with those who enter the data and continuing to flow through security professionals who protect the data, specialists who manage the data, analysts who describe the data, and executives who use the data to inform their strategies. UMS has created a data governance managing framework that involves people from all levels, universities, and operational areas. The data governance structure includes system- wide Functional Committees (e.g., finance, registration, financial aid, etc), a Data Advisory Committee (DAC), and a Data Governance Council (See Attachment #8 regarding Data Governance Charter). The Functional Committees and DAC are working together to address opportunities and challenges for handling data across the seven UMS campuses. By comparison, the Data Governance Council is the executive team that sets priorities, makes decisions, and provides overall leadership.

In addition to dashboard development and data governance, the IR effort is moving forward on other fronts to fix problems, address needs, and improve data quality. First, solutions to specific data issues are a priority of the functional teams and the DAC. A few examples of the issues on which these committees are working include: campus consistency in capturing and validating codes for faculty credentials, course identification, and degree designation; authorizing analysts with the access to the data they need to perform their duties; providing an adequate set of data tools; gathering information on faculty workload; and creating a common data repository to enhance sharing and security.

Second, the DAC is working with a consultant to design a system to support a data mart with tools to publish and manage web-based dashboards. Committees are reviewing technology solutions including retiring current technology, buying new technology, or using freely available technology. In addition, the committees currently are tasked with troubleshooting gaps in our data impeding the UMS from having a robust set of KPIs.

Third, Institutional Researchers from across the UMS are collaboratively creating a common dataset. The dataset will combine student enrollment, faculty workload, salaries, student bills, space, financial aid, et al. The common dataset will allow managers to view all important facets of unit activity, revenue, and expenditures.

Fourth, UMS partnered with Hanover Research in 2017 by using national data sets (IPEDS, GASB, etc.) to develop a multifaceted approach for identifying peer institutions for each of the UMS universities. In addition to development of these peers and an underlying dashboard for peer comparisons, UMS staff also

undertook extensive interaction through visits, open forums, electronic communication, etc. with campus leaders, faculty and staff to discuss the methodology, preliminary identification of peers and ultimately the confirmation of peer institutions. These peers are beginning to be used at the System and campus levels for comparisons and assessment of performance. The UMS is also discussing with Hanover the possibility of identifying “System” peers for the UMS. Identification of such System peers is less straightforward because national databases, such as IPEDS, are not organized by System; and, of course, fewer Systems exist for comparison than institutions existing for campus peers.

Conclusion: The ongoing discussions with CIHE have been enormously helpful to the UMS, and the UMS approach today has not deviated from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) findings of approximately a year ago, in which it was stated that “...at this stage in the process, accredited universities within the system remain the primary focal point for quality assurance and are the degree-granting entities in multi-campus academic initiatives in a manner that conforms to the CIHE standards.” The NCHEMS findings and UMS commitments notwithstanding, and as CIHE is well aware, public higher education in Maine is facing enormous financial and demographic challenges, while also being expected to serve as pivotal catalyst to Maine’s economic development strategy. UMS and the State of Maine, therefore, need the continued support and flexibility from CIHE to pursue “perceptive and imaginative innovation aimed at increasing the effectiveness of higher education” as stated in the preamble to the CIHE accreditation standards.

Attachments

- #1 – PIF Guidelines
- #2 – Program for Examination Process
- #3 – Neely UMFK-UMPI Memo
- #4 – Barriers to Multi-campus programming
- #5 – SUNY
- #6 – North Texas Federation
- #7 – Cross-listing summary
- #8 - Data Governance Charter