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Summary of Summer Internal Scan Work

Presentation to Direction Package Advisory Board
12/6/2013
Participants

• Dr. Andy Anderson, Dean, CSTH
• Dr. Susan Campbell, Chief Student Success Officer (co-chair)
• Dr. Joyce Gibson, Dean, LAC
• Ms. Elizabeth Higgins, Executive Director, Student Success
• Dr. Lynn Kuzma, Dean, CAHS
• Dr. Samantha Langley-Turnbaugh, Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean, Graduate Studies
• Dr. Monique LaRocque, Executive Director, PCE
• Dr. Dahlia Lynn, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
• Dr. Joseph McDonnell, Dean, CMHS
• Ms. Sally Meredith, Chief of Staff, Provost’s Office
• Mr. David Nutty, University Librarian
• Dr. Michael Stevenson, Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs (co-chair)
Objectives/Intended Outcomes for Work were Multi-Layered

• Completion of an honest and comprehensive scan of the internal environment.
  • Development of preliminary themes around which USM’s myriad roles and responsibilities seemed to the group to be clustered as a public, comprehensive university in Maine
• Provision of a preliminary assessment of strengths, limitations, and opportunities within each thematic area and sub-areas that could be used to inform future discussions regarding areas of promise, opportunity, and competitive advantage.
• Work was Iterative

• Brainstorming Regarding Descriptive Characteristics of USM

  • Comments and Characteristics “sorted” and “resorted” into thematic categories.
  • Initial Work Recorded and Provided to all Members to “jumpstart” further conversations.
• Development of Representative “Mind Maps” for Further Discussion and Refinement

• Preliminary Ideas Regarding Program/Organizational Opportunities for Competitive Advantage
Preliminary Themes and “Maps”

• Focus on Refining “Mind Maps” and Identifying Potential Competitive Advantage Areas
  • Ratings were provided, as possible
  • 1-4 scale, with 1=“not so much” and 4=“excellence”

• Seven (7) Preliminary “Major” Thematic Categories Identified
Seven Themes

1) Location – we are a university with four (4) front doors; Gorham, Portland, Lewiston, and Virtual. Our rating of how effective we have been with regard to capitalizing on our access points and location was 1.
Location
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2) **Programs** – as a comprehensive university, USM has a wide variety of programs, many of which are competitive. While we did not rate our overall effectiveness in this area, we did express concern in this competitive environment about the extent to which we have been—or have not been—responsive to the market with regard to our majors.
3. **Transitions** – as the mind map shows, there are a number of student transitions taking place at USM. We have students coming to us from high school, from other colleges, from the workplace to college, from other countries, etc. We think our potential in providing students with seamless transitions is high; we will need to focus our energies, however, in order to do so effectively.
Transitions

Student to Alum/Pathways of Graduates
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Graduate to Career/College to Career
Undergraduate to Graduate
Non-Degree to Degree
4. **Engaged Pedagogy** – this is another area in which we think there may be potential; our challenge is how to take advantage of what we do have and build upon that foundation through faculty and staff development.
5. **Community Connections** – again, this area was not rated overall and, as with the previous two, we think there is opportunity in this area, particularly given our location. It was understood that we have many community connections; we need to be more intentional not only about developing these connections, but in communicating our effectiveness in this area to our respective communities.
6. Opportunities for Access & Accessibility – as a comprehensive university in the most populous part of the State, there is opportunity in this area for us to expand our efforts.
7. **Learning-Centered Culture** – the cultural discussion seemed to most, if not all of us in the Sub-Group, to be the “heart of the matter”. What is our culture? Are we learning-centered and, if so, what evidence exists to demonstrate that we truly are?
Learning-Centered Culture

- Strong relationship between theory & practice--classroom & faculty
- "Faculty and Staff Engagement"
- normative culture based on caring & support
- Collaborative Partnerships (external)--Includes Community Connections (+3)
- Faculty and Staff Role Clarification (+5)
- Environmental Sustainability
- Faculty and Staff who are actively engaged in the success of their students--academically, intellectually and experientially (+3)
- High Quality (+4)
- Co-Curricular Programming, ski, sail, arts, culture (+1)
- Philanthropy
- Professional Development
- Institutional Balance Between Teaching, Research, and Service
- Succession Management
- Shared Vision/Shared Governance (+1)
References/Data Used

NEASC Accreditation Self-Study
Foundations of Excellence Dimensions Report
Enrollment Plan
Individual Perception and Anecdote
Sample Compressed & Expanded Mind Map

- Engaged Pedagogy
  - Applied/Active Learning
    - 5
  - Student Learning Centered
    - 6
  - Faculty Development
    - 3
  - Student Learning Communities
    - 3
Rating Template Example