

12-20-2013

Direction Package Advisory Board Notes - December 20, 2013

Direction Package Advisory Board

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usm.maine.edu/direction_package

Recommended Citation

Direction Package Advisory Board, "Direction Package Advisory Board Notes - December 20, 2013" (2013). *Direction Package*. 40.

https://digitalcommons.usm.maine.edu/direction_package/40

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Institutional Memory at USM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Direction Package by an authorized administrator of USM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jessica.c.hovey@maine.edu.

Direction Package Advisory Board Notes

December 20, 2013

133 Wishcamper, Portland Campus

Attending:

Bill Wells, Jeanne Munger, Ed Mckersie, Kristi Hertlein, Judy Shepard-Kegl (late), Margo Luken, Amy Amico, Jessica Picard, Christy Hammer, Blake Whitaker, Lynn Kuzma, Laurenz Schmidt, Kelsea Dunham, Jon Barker, Joy Pufhal, Monique LaRocque, Bruce Clarey, Joe McDonnell, Pamela Roy, Andy Anderson, Carol Nemeroff, Carlos Luck, Bob Blackwood, Samantha Langley-Turnbaugh,

Guests:

Dave Stevens, Theo Kalikow, Dick Campbell, Bob Caswell, Michael Stevenson, Sharoo Wengland, Nick (Muskie student), Susan Campbell, Martha Freeman, Jerry LaSala, Tamara Mitchell

- The three groups broke into their working subgroups.
 - The then provided a brief overview to the larger DP group to provide a review of what they discussed, their next steps and comments.
-

Report out

Group 1 – Identity

Attendance: Kelsea Dunham, Lynn Kuzma, Samantha-Langley Turnbaugh, Monique LaRocque (facilitator), Margo Luken, Joe McDonnell, , Ed McKersie,

Guests: Tracy St.Pierre , USM Marketing and Brand Management , and Bob Caswell, UMS PR. Tracy and Bob were invited to the subgroup meeting to share their work on building an identity through marketing.

Monique introduced the meeting with a basic definition from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which defines what "community engagement" is for universities that seek their "Elective Community Engagement Classification:"

"Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity;

enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good."

Using this as a starting point, and exploring the concept of USM being an urban, metropolitan university (which is a distinguishing feature unique to USM in Maine), the group had a lot of conversation:

USM has to be an integral part of the community and state. We need to serve them well. This means we need community engagement and collaboration with the state, non-profit, for profit and municipality.

Start with what we know. We do not have to recreate the wheel. Should we stay with the status quo or go radically different?

We are a traditional organization and what we have been doing is not working. We need to explore going down a different path.

We need to develop coherent and cohesive themes for this University and market the institution. We have always failed in this task. We have not been in the market place long enough or consistently enough to promote a USM identity. Search for a Common USM Theme (Slide 3 handout)

Successful campaigns must be based on a single, compelling theme that is distinctive within your market, resonates with internal and external audiences AND is an accurate reflection of your organization. Our image needs to be true.

We cannot be all things to all people.

Tracy St. Pierre and Bob Caswell also reported that USM Marketing Department has been working with Rinck Advertising for 18 months to get a coherent theme for the University. Rinck is a collaborative firm with expertise in social media.

What can USM say that differentiates us from every other University?

The depths of the connections with the community and other partnerships are not there. We have 32,000 alumni in the state of Maine and we are not using them as a resource.

USM has a reputation as "second choice". We don't know who we are serving. In order to increase our enrollment we need to raise the profile of the institution as well as untangle our audiences so we can market to each group individually. Our identity should unite what we do and how we offer our services to each group.

We need to increase our reputation to high school students, teachers, counselors, and coaches.

Dual effort in marketing and customer service.

Connections Campaign means flexibility and intentionality.

USM is the Metropolitan school of Southern and Central Maine

Lynn Kuzma's ideas:

USM could distinguish itself from others in these program areas:

- School of Business
- Creative Economy
- Education
- Public Policy
- Health
- Science and Technology

We need to find out how to serve and connect with the community. Create innovative sets:

- Creativity
- Social Justice
- Entrepreneurship
- Global studies

The city would be our lab in which we would engage in internships, service learning, entrepreneurship, study abroad, and student research. We would send competent, well rounded, experienced students into the community and grow from there.

Students would take EYE course along with (a) Social Ethical Responsibility course (b) Global Awareness

(c) Capstone/Internship (d) 1 other course in their major.

Above is the outline for undergraduate. We would then look at Graduate and Professional.

Students demonstrate through portfolio/implementation. We would align our core with the community themes. This would lead to jobs in Maine when a student graduates. Focus on internships and service learning. We need to sustain a commitment to community and business. We need to provide an **authentic experience**. We do not want to be known as a diploma mill.

We spent some time discussing the concept of **authentic experience**. There seemed to be consensus that this would be a good distinguishing attribute for USM.

We have the ability to change the state of Maine.

How do we make this a reality:

- Keep track of alumni
- Better use of existing resources
- Hold individuals accountable
- Determine what programs meet our needs and go over requirements
- Commitment to grow the University

In our commitment to grow the University we need to:

- Create pathways from undergraduate to graduate
- Create a model for distance learning
- Challenge out of state tuition

We need to have a plan for implementation:

- How to develop partnerships
- Student services
- Alumni liaisons

We need to be innovative and set students up for career preparation. Innovation needs to be flexible. We need to create a model that enforces competency for students.

Curriculum:

At this time the faculty is in charge of course curriculum. Should the Dean have more power? The Dean could “set the table” for faculty. The Dean would present curriculum choices for the faculty. This could give the Dean the ability to empower and reward faculty. It was also noted that there should be more respect from staff for faculty.

We decided we would make the following points to bring back to the larger DP group:

1. Context for our sub-group discussion, which was informed by material handed out ahead of time:
 1. A Southern Maine Imperative: Meeting the Region's Higher Education Needs in the
 2. A Southern Maine Imperative II: A Vital and Healthy Southern Maine Region :
 3. CUMU Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities:
<http://www.cumuonline.org>
 4. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching definition of "community engagement" for universities that seek their "Elective Community Engagement Classification:"

We invited Tracy St. Pierre and Bob Caswell to discuss “Connections” theme in USM marketing and what they have learned about USM ‘value proposition” in their work with Rinck.

2. Lynn presented a possible scenario on how we could organize ourselves around curricular themes and structures.

3. We shared our belief that we need to invest in GROWTH, FLEXIBLE and INNOVATION.

4. We must develop an implementation plan that will support a new vision.

Comments provided after the report out:

Comment: This is the LAC model and the thematic theme is being underutilized at USM currently.

Comment: We need to use LAC as the model.

Comment: We all need to change our thinking about why we are here and doing the work we are doing. There will need to be a cultural change at USM.

Comment: These are aspirational goals, but it will take a while to reach these goals. What about what we are doing now?

Answer: The team decided the best way to change is to think about the aspirational goals and then figure out how to reach those goals.

Comment: It was suggested that an inventory be taken of the current service learning projects across the university to learn from those areas and grow them.

Comment: We need to ensure the faculty and staff are aware of the connections we have with the community.

Group 2 – C.O.R.E. (Creating, Operational, Responsibility & Excellence)

Group #2

Expenses

1. What to Do? What is the approach?
2. How to Do It? Procedural recommendations, Execute

Not personal- put spending in context with value delivered and in demand with current & future students

Things to Look At: (Costs outweigh Benefits) Conceptual Approaches

- Duplicated Services
Libraries, Student Accounts, Financial Aid, Facilities, Student Success

*Technology has changed some processes- and eliminated need for some front line Administrative services.

- Stop doing things no longer in demand by Students and businesses (community) - BASED ON DATA

- OUTSOURCING (outside of technology and learning)

Admissions	Counseling	Facilities	Remedial Education
Bookstore	Custodial	Human Resources	Housing
Conferences	Dining	Motorpool	Health Services
Computing	Tuition Payment		

- Budget Model – Example: LAC has a revenue projection; Should each college have one to work to as well.
 - o Responsible budget Management!
 - o Challenge to this Model: counterproductive to collaboration; promotes “competition”

Validation of the Conceptual

----> Procedural -->

Recommendations (if not executed than not worth the weight of the paper it is written on)

CONDUCT VALIDATION PLEASE – Test w/Stakeholders: Students, Parents, Community, Employers

What to do/What not to do

A + B ----> nose to spite face

- Spending down budgets for “fear” of losing it

What are our “Pillars”: Central to Mission

- Recruitment
- Retention and Persistence
- Quality of Student Experience
- Quality of Education

Challenges:

- Split campus makes traditional experience difficult

CONDENSE to Priorities

What matters more/less

What doesn't matter

Comments provided after the report out:

Comment: There are overlaps between group 1 & 2 and if questionnaires are going to be sent, the questions should include information/questions from both groups

Comment: USM has already done some of this questionnaire work so we shouldn't hold up moving forward to do the questionnaires again. We need to find the past surveys and review them.

Answer: Much of this material is on the DP website, listed in the Title III grant, and provided in previous strategic plan documents

Group 3 – Academic programs

Direction Package Subgroup 3

The ultimate charge of this subcommittee (membership is listed in Exhibit 1) is to assist in the identification of some specific ways that USM might reduce the budget for 2015 sufficient to meet the projected deficiency of \$14 million in line with the strategic elements outlined in the Direction Package Outline in Exhibit 2. We have been asked to identify each of the programs at USM, develop a process for evaluating each in terms of its contribution to the long-term growth potential and revenue enhancement potential of USM, develop a set of consistent criteria to use in evaluating each program to determine to which of the following categories it belongs:¹

1. Signature program – unique programs at USM that will be targeted for additional investment
2. Key or emerging program – important programs at USM that will be targeted for additional investment
3. Foundational programs – programs at USM that are not growing
4. Evolving programs – programs that need to do something different, presumably those that will not stay at USM

¹ We are using these specific categories to be consistent with those previously developed within the system.

The committee has been asked to make progress toward the University of Maine System goal of determining the programs that USM will “own” and which it will “share” across the other units in the system in order to bring about increased efficiency and enhanced synergy of system resources as a whole. To that end, the committee is developing a research instrument to capture input about the programs.² The instruments will be circulated, requesting input from program administrators, although it does not preclude involvement and input from individuals who deliver and support each program. This is intended as a first pass at determining the categorization for each program, which will be subsequently used by the committee to refine the categorization of the programs. (Note that the focus of this is academic programs, although it is yet undetermined whether similar assessment will be necessary for nonacademic programs.)

During the Direction Package meeting on December 13, 2013, Dave Stevens, Facilitator, UMS Organizational Effectiveness, circulated the following set of considerations for categorization of programs from Dickerson, Robert C. (publishing year unknown) titled *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*:

1. History, development, and expectations of the programs
2. External demand for the program
3. Internal demand for the program
4. Quality of the program inputs and processes
5. Quality of program outcomes
6. Size, scope, and productivity of the program
7. Revenue and other resources generated by the program
8. Costs and other expenses associated with the program
9. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program
10. Opportunity analysis of the program

During the Direction Package meeting on December 20, 2013, the committee identified a number of specific criteria, both quantitative and qualitative, with which to categorize the programs, as follows (in no specific order):

1. Brand
2. High level of accreditation
3. Interdisciplinary (?)
4. Student demand
 - a. Number of applications (by program and school)
 - b. Enrollment (by program and school)
 - c. Headcount (by program and school)
 - d. Student credit hours (by program and school)
 - e. Number of degrees awarded (by program and school)
 - f. First-year retention by major

² The instrument will be designed using criteria the subcommittee develops for categorizing programs into the four categories identified.

- g. Transfer retention by major
- 5. Centrality to mission
- 6. Visibility
- 7. Research and publications (quality and quantity)
- 8. Cost and revenue (by department)
- 9. Responsiveness to the community
- 10. Collaborative (across programs, departments)
- 11. Student centric
- 12. Internships, community engagement (quantity and quality)
- 13. Geography
- 14. Contribution to Gen Ed
- 15. Amount of grant/external funding
- 16. Organizational factors
 - a. University leadership
 - b. Dynamics

It is our understanding that the ultimate purpose of this activity is to inform the Direction Package Leadership of how the budget for USM might be adjusted downward to meet the budget guidelines we have been provided. In the process, it is important to remind the Direction Package Leadership that USM has been historically underfunded compared to other units of the University System. USM therefore starts at the tenuous position where it has successfully operated with minimal resource funding, having engaged in significant budget cuts in the recent past. Furthermore, USM has been in direct competition with the flagship campus, to the detriment of capitalizing on significant growth potential in Southern Maine, which is projected to be the area where the most growth is expected in the near future.

EXHIBIT 1

DIRECTION PACKAGE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Andy	Anderson	Dean, College of Science, Technology & Health	andrew@usm.maine.edu	780-5585
Jon	Barker	Undergraduate Student Admissions	jbarker@usm.maine.edu	780-5724
Bob	Blackwood	Alumni Board	Rblackw2@maine.rr.com	767-3052
Bruce	Clary	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/Professor in Muskie	brucec@usm.maine.edu	780-4865
Christy	Hammer	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/ Prof. of Social & Behavioral Sciences	chammer@usm.maine.edu	453-6518
Carlos	Luck	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/Prof. of Electrical Engineering	luck@usm.maine.edu	780-5583
Jeanne	Munger (Chair)	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/Prof. of Business Administration	jmunger@usm.maine.edu	780-4925
Carol	Nemeroff	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/Prof of Social & Behavioral Sciences	cnemeroff@usm.maine.edu	753-6671
Judy	Shepard-Kegl	FS Budget & Strategic Planning Com/Prof. of Linguistics	kegl@maine.edu	780-5955
Mary	Sloan	Graduate Studies	msloan@usm.maine.edu	780-4812
Bill	Wells (Co-Chair)	Facilities	wells@usm.maine.edu	780-4995

EXHIBIT 2

DIRECTION PACKAGE OUTLINE - Draft 1³

DIRECTION PACKAGE = ALIGNMENT, INTENTIONALITY, COLLABORATION
COMPONENTS: VISION, CHARTER, MISSION, VALUES, STRATEGIES, TACTICS

USM VISION

Preferred future state of USM to energize the membership (aspirational, inspiring future state)

- Transforms students' lives for life-long learning and success
- Teaches responsibility to the larger community
- Helps its students and communities experience today and imagine tomorrow
- Meets intellectual, cultural and economic needs of our communities, region and state

USM CHARTER

What must be done to maintain support for USM by key financial supporters (charge to the organization)⁴

- Offer an organized program of instruction, research and experimentation and service for the citizens of the state;
- Make effective use of resources by maximum emphasis on "commuters" (today possibly read "via other modes of instructional delivery besides face-to-face, residential instruction");
- Advance the Maine economy cooperatively with public and private sectors;
- Require an active brand of learning, combining classroom instruction and practical experience

USM MISSION

What USM does to fulfill its charter (what it does)

The mission of USM is two-fold:

- To prepare students for a life of fulfillment and engagement in an increasingly complex and global society by providing access to a quality undergraduate liberal education as well as an array of relevant graduate and professional programs and,
- To contribute to the intellectual, cultural, and economic well-being of the local community, the region and the state through research, scholarship, and creative activity

³ This is the first outline draft of the Direction Package.

⁴ *Synopsis of what the legislature wrote in 1865.*

USM's VALUES

The ideals and principles that USM expects of its membership (guides behavior of USM membership)

USM's values are to serve, collaborate and create. We accomplish this by providing and committing to:

- Individual worth & collegiality
- Respect
- Positive and supportive work environment

DIRECTION PACKAGE OUTLINE - Draft 1

USM's VALUES (Continued)

- Adhering to USM's Mission
- Educational excellence
- Creativity & Innovation
- Collaboration
- Academic freedom
- Integrity
- Diversity
- Critical Inquiry & Self-reflection
- Adaptive leadership
- Civic participation
- Community responsiveness
- Service to others
- Responsible fiscal stewardship
- Responsible stewardship for a sustained USM

USM Strategies for Student Success, Community Engagement and Fiscal Sustainability

Major areas of focus for the next 3 to 5 years (major subsets of the plan)

- Leverage USM's 4 portals to student success (Gorham, LAC, Portland, Virtual)
- Value students' previous experience (e.g. PLA, transfer credit)
- Strengthen select undergraduate, graduate and professional programs
- Deploy best-practice recruitment and retention strategies that integrate academic and student affairs
- Attract and retain faculty and staff who instill active learning concepts throughout all aspects of the University
- Infuse engaged learning throughout USM's graduate, professional, undergraduate and community education offerings
- Recognize, celebrate, and nurture a faculty and staff engaged with the University and community which will drive economic development and cultural enrichment through intentional and systemic involvement with community organizations, employers, alumni and donors
- Manage resources and costs wisely, prudently and with appropriate transparency
- Routinely share institutional data and solicit feedback that is incorporated into data driven strategic decisions
- Align philanthropic goals and key University priorities

- Leverage the expertise, experience and resources of our external partners to achieve mutually held goals
- Enhance affordability through cost controls, pricing and financial aid
- Foster a culture of accountability to deliver on the promise of student success

TACTICS/INITIATIVES

Individual components of the plan (smaller subsets of the plan)

- To be determined at a later date

Comments provided after the report out:

Comment: We have discussed the efficiency and effectiveness today. Are we going to address the effectiveness of non-academic areas like financial aid, etc.?

Answer: Group 2 will look at the administrative effectiveness and efficiency.

Comment: We also have a lot of non-academic areas that could be a potential regional model and are we looking at those units?

Group 4 – Academic leadership (optimize current state)

- Provost Michael Stevenson provided an overview of a meeting he had with the Academic Leadership Team (ALT) regarding strategic and intentional changes that will be made for FY15 to Academic Affairs.
- The ALT consists of the Deans, Chairs and Associate Deans. This team has been working together to find ways to make short-term changes, that could be made by February 2014, that will assist with the structural gap and provide USM with a more competitive advantage and better student experience.
- The changes being implemented need to be done for USM to receive the future years' Title III grant money and to increase retention its' retention rate.

A copy of Michael Stevenson's email sent to the campus on December 20, 2013 providing an overview of the changes is copied below.

Dear Colleagues:

“This time it's different.”

That is one of the key themes which emerged from this fall's New England Board of Higher Education's “Summit on Cost in Higher Education.” A summary of those themes cites “A ‘perfect storm’ of financial, political, demographic and technological forces have aligned to make the ‘business model’ unsustainable for the majority of U.S. higher education institutions (HEIs).” The full summary is available at <http://bit.ly/1gG311v>

The document underscores a growing, collective sense of urgency for change throughout higher education.

As noted at last Monday's meeting of our Academic Affairs Leadership Team (AALT), we face our own special challenges including a fiscal gap, the large number of competitive and aggressive institutions in our catchment area, and the decline in traditional age college students.

Our projected structural deficit for FY15 now totals \$14 million. Recurring decreases in enrollment caused declining tuition revenue, coupled with our failure to meet last year's reduction targets, our commitment to invest in scholarships to be more competitive and the need to address the deterioration of the physical plant of our campuses means we must aggressively implement a number of strategies to reduce instructional cost.

Student persistence and retention are the most promising tools in improving the financial viability of higher education institutions. Low graduation rates not only represent a loss of resources (1% enrollment is approximately \$650K) but also require greater and greater investment of additional resources for recruitment. For USM, that means we must actively and intentionally engage in strategies to improve retention, persistence, and graduation rates.

One part of the solution is to become more efficient across Academic Affairs. At Monday's AALT meeting, I outlined seven steps we must take, which I believe will make better use of our faculty's expertise; create a more coherent schedule that provides a clear pathway to graduation; deliver fiscally sustainable programs; and generate savings. Our ability to make these types of scheduling and course changes should reduce the need for more drastic university-level changes.

1. Develop year-long course schedules. Producing a year-long schedule will enable better planning on our part, and enable our students to have more timely information and predictability for planning their academic schedules. We will begin with AY 2014-2015. The Fall '14 schedule is due February 7 and the Spring '15 schedule is due February 14.
2. Offer greater schedule variability with regard to days and times. Departments must offer courses that provide greater variability beyond the 10:00 – 2:00 time block that currently reflects over 60% of our undergraduate schedules. "Flattening" the schedule will allow for a better utilization of campus space, help relieve parking congestion, support student success, and be responsive to what our students have repeatedly requested.
3. Streamline the number and range of course offerings to produce an achievable enrollment. Our goal is to avoid the need to cancel courses by initially scheduling courses we are confident will fill, knowing we can add extra sections later as need is demonstrated.
4. Increase section sizes (within reasonable parameters and classroom seating limits) rather than opening new sections. This must be a consideration by all departments. Our target is to have, in the aggregate, average section sizes of 30 for undergraduate courses and 15 to 18 for

graduate courses. Departments must strategically balance smaller labs and seminars with larger sections which use other pedagogical strategies. We can provide a rationale for occasionally offering under-enrolled sections if averages are at this level and the sections are offered to address persistence toward graduation.

5. Reduce expenditures associated with part-time and overload instructional costs. Streamlining course offerings will enable departments to reduce expenditures in personnel costs.

6. Become more strategic in the offering of courses. Department Chairs and their faculty must become more strategic in considering course periodicity and frequency of offerings. As an example, courses that are offered every semester with an enrollment of 15 might be moved to an every other semester offering with an enrollment of 30. Additionally, departments must begin to identify specific courses that should be taught online or as a hybrid to increase enrollments and reduce number of sections.

7. Adhere to expectations regarding teaching loads. Teaching loads should reflect a 3/3 expectation for tenure-track/tenured faculty and 4/4 expectation for full-time non-tenure track faculty. We must minimize assigned time for purposes other than teaching and re-examine faculty service requirements where appropriate while supporting assigned time for research based on external funding.

The aforementioned New England Board of Higher Education document makes a critically important point. Affordability and quality are NOT mutually exclusive. We must sustain our commitment to quality while becoming more efficient.

Please remember, the Direction Package Advisory Committee is developing additional recommendations that will further our transformation. You can contribute to that process through the Direction Package website. www.usm.maine.edu/directionpackage

We can and will launch new programs with existing human and fiscal resources in high demand areas of study with clear connection to employment needs. We will build and sustain partnerships with business and industry to increase internship opportunities for students and joint projects of mutual benefit. We will increase our collaboration across the System in many areas. We will become more “distinct” in select areas while sharing other programs. Our longer term staffing strategy must balance tenure track with full-time continuing, non-tenure track faculty, enabling us to protect research, scholarship, and the creative activity agenda.

Finally, we will continue to have important campus conversations about strategic, intentional choices that will enable us to sustain USM’s institutional mission and the community and students we serve.

The Deans and Department Chairs are doing this work as next year's schedule is due just seven weeks from now. Coming together on these issues is important work. Please consider me a resource as you engage in conversations and craft solutions to the structural deficit.

Best regards,

Michael
Michael R Stevenson, PhD
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Comments provided after the report out:

Comment: Have we considered going to a three semester university?

Answer: Yes, but that is a conversation for a later time after we streamline our current university operations.

Comment: Will we eventually consider collaborating more with the community colleges or dual enrollment with them or other System campuses?

Answer: Yes, collaboration continues and we hope to eventually get to the option of enrolling students in dual institutions