



Program Integration Oversight Committee

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

Room 305, 16 Central, Bangor

Attendance: Ellen Chaffee, Nathan Grant, Mary-Louis Davitt, Tina Baughman, Bill DeSisto, Tony Envera, Grog Johnson, Barb Blackstone, Gary Johnson, Sheri Fraser, Jeff Hecker, Cynthia Huggins, Dana Saucier, Charlie Bernacchio, Dave Stevens, Kate Foster, Chris O'Brien, Lois-Ann Kuntz, Eric Jones

1) Welcome, QOD, Agenda Review

Question of the day -

- Where are you?
- Read the Chaffee report and take as plan of action.
- Be forward thinker and open and honest
- Elaborative education
- Listen, breathe, and more coffee available
- Remember it's a long way from the bridge to valve and stern
- Be bold
- Stay focused and do not get lured by bright shiny objects
- Train keep rolling
- Ellen's report, read twice and focus as plan of action
- Intentional and build upon efforts already undertaken and give credit
- Bring superman cape

2) From Previous Meeting

- a) Communications Review – Tamara Mitchell – double booked unable to review at this meeting
 - i) Communications flow chart, individual roles of OC members, other updates
 - ii) How to ensure BOV engagement, information
- b) Revise the Program Integration charter (Eric, Charlie); note new flow chart
 - i) Approved by CAOs
- c) Briefing on progress, Rounds 1 and 2
 - i) Round 2 – final phone call with chairs: Everyone on track to deliver report on March 1
 - ii) Each team has CAO working with them
 - iii) Round 1 –
 - (1) All teams moving forward
 - (2) Languages will meet tomorrow
 - (3) History meets this month
 - (4) Budget distributed for the requests by the teams
 - (5) Grog – trustee views
 - (a) 2 critical areas

- (i) Nursing – need someone assigned – economic future
 - 1. If we need more resources than have it come from top of the pile
 - (ii) Marine Science –
 - (6) Tanya Sleeper is now the CAO for Nursing
 - (7) Nursing already collaborating, there is progress being made.
 - (8) Marine Science – Kay Kimball.
 - (a) Chancellor challenged this team – they are moving forward and implementing the changes coming out of APRIP report
 - (b) Presenting idea to Chancellor this afternoon
 - iv) Some programs are different and working with diversities as strengths
 - v) Nursing scheduled meeting on Feb 5th.
 - d) Flow Chart
 - i) This has been reviewed and CAOs will be following
 - ii) Boxes 3, 4, and 5 being done now
 - iii) March 11 will be meeting with Team leaders and CAOs
 - iv) Process will continue even though Ellen is leaving
 - v) Communication and interruptions weren't clear last time, this is included in this chart now
 - vi) CAOs will lead the process; Jeff Hecker is interim team leader
 - e) Chaffee report and recommendations to the Chancellor
 - i) Delivered to trustees yesterday
 - ii) Opportunity for further comments, challenge, add
 - iii) Most approved
 - iv) Grog –
 - (1) Modified resolution any input from this meeting or information that might come from campuses, Academic Student Affairs Committee.
 - v) Final report had a mistake – said OC had time to review which wasn't the case
 - vi) Any questions?
 - (1) Has not gone to BOV and not sure what the plans are
 - (2) Posted on website now as part of Board meeting materials – public knowledge
 - (3) Up to Chancellor on what to do with report next
 - vii) Grog added – demographically and competition, if we are going to be successful, change inclination on arc of enrollment etc., we need to execute for future of university and to the state.
 - f) Nathan has been creating reports, shows need for IT and additional staffing support.
 - i) Thank you for your services, Nathan
 - ii) Still in process of what needs doing.
 - iii) Communication, Communication, Communication
 - iv) IR function – data and what the facts are – it is critical and Grog also thanks Nathan.
 - g) Thanks to Dave Stevens – lead leaders through developmental process, especially with Presidents.
 - h) Thanks to Tina – taking care of business behind the scenes
 - i) Hire VCAA position is recommended as well as an additional person
 - i) Ellen has identified a number of potential candidates
- 3) Updates since last meeting
 - a) Chief Academic Officers/VCAA report (Cindy)
 - i) CAO has taken market data and dug into Portfolio Review. Identifying potential areas that they will explore and possibly create new programs. Continue looking and researching and

making decisions at upcoming meetings. Looking at programs with fairly quick enrollment growth. Jobs and competition.

- ii) Regarding cutting programs over the last few years: Low hanging fruit already been cut so for time being program growth is being looked at.
 - iii) Unified online – recommendation to presidents’ council – model to go back to faculty senate – programs that are collaborative and set of parameters what we are trying to launch now. CAO charge is to get reaction/response from each senate and report back. Follow through with Charge for Trustees. Set of Guidelines and move at slower pace.
 - iv) Discussion of Peter Schillings and all the new technology options to help us soar to the future.
 - v) Programs online – Tony asks to include in planning and discussions faculty who already teach online. There are a lot of moving parts and not easy conversions. Many faculty disappointed they were not included.
 - (a) Dave Stevens – pulled together faculty groups, there was a great deal of consultation that went into the unified online report. If you want to be more involved, just tell your CAO
- b) Presidents Council report (Kate)
- i) Academic Transformation Plan – consensus on the need for an additional stage. Mission differentiation is stalled at the system level. Looking forward to Round 2 reports.
- c) Member reports: updates on communications and questions for group consideration
- i) Lois Ann – Machias – concern – data being distributed. The way the information is compiled is faulty.
 - (1) Nathan – Did not include indicators for Round 1. Now has new reports being sent out with those indicators.
 - ii) Tony – Faculty comments re: reports
 - (1) Is there going to be a round 3? Will the other programs be able to be in round 3?
 - (a) Ellen – encourage volunteer initiatives. No Round 3 at this time, but we do want to encourage spirit. We also want to do right by the 16 already working. During stage 4, take under advisement. It is a pause to restructure.
 - (b) Jeff – hopefully when we get to round 3, the charge will be different because current challenges already will be addressed. System will continue to support those that want to continue.
 - (i) How do you get that word out? How are you going to make it official?
 - 1. What is the capacity of the committee to help out with that?
 - 2. Encourage CAOs to take message back to faculty.
 - (2) Tony to Ellen - In your report, looking at faculty workloads and no information about collective bargaining. Where in the report did it discuss collective bargaining questions?
 - (a) Not in section 5 as a recommendation; it is a suggestion.
 - (b) Mark Schmeltz has been involved with CAOs and been at the meetings frequently. He will be talking to CAOs and figuring things out.
 - iii) Grog – creating a culture – personal opinion – impact of this process will have a dramatic impact on culture within system. Think of any course being collaborative. Credit transfers and all aspects of academic transformation. We are here for students and on a journey to provide higher education for the students.
- 4) Review and ensure progress on Round 2 review process, per the November flow chart
- a) Already covered above

5) Goals and action plans for remainder of 2015-2016

- a) The role of the committee after this year. If round 3 not scheduled, will we be continuing to monitor rounds 1 and 2?
- b) Stage 4 – revenue generation recommendation
 - i) CAOs have been discussing.
 - ii) Engineering as 400 more students at UM. How do we grow to have the capacity?
 - iii) Older people as a target for marketing or just looking at younger generation for engineering?
 - (1) We have been utilizing market data research where we can take workforce-related education
 - (2) Revenue growth – new opportunities academic and non-academic, as well. Many agencies are looking for partners. How we can go together for some grants.
 - (3) How are we going to go after target markets without stepping on each other? Think of revenue generators that are new opportunities.
 - (4) It's not a new question, there has been a lot of work done on this.
- c) Discussion on tuition and enrollments
 - i) Communications for counselors, media, Washington post, etc. (flagship match)
- d) Find market niche for each campus.
- e) Faculty member concerned about rapid growth in enrollment. If we don't address capacity issue then the experience of students will not be as advertised, reputation drops. Difficulty finding rooms on campus. Budget becoming unified. What happens when we keep growing and on campus living is limited?
- f) You can survive the old way and you can survive the new way but can you survive the blanketly blank transition?
- g) Facing competitive forces, privates, 35%. We aren't doing well marketing against privates. Marketing research – capture niche. Southern NH enrolls you on the phone within 1 hour, has you captivated.
- h) CJ master's degree recommendation from R1 and Husson is getting our students.
- i) Culture – privates – must compete to survive. Different momentum to get to that point. Mindset of success. Has effect on bottom line.
 - i) Market research shows this.
 - ii) We have systems very different than privates. Maybe change the system and reward faculty with incentives for how we beat the competition. Change contract.
 - iii) Sense of urgency that we don't have.
 - iv) Grog agrees. Create culture that has sense of urgency like our competitors and need to get beyond that. Retention and graduation. Seize on these issues.
 - v) Communication issues within the system. Example land grants. Stop the competition between universities.
 - vi) Issues of collaborating and share courses that can be done easily.
 - vii) Do something they can't do.

6) Next meeting date, agenda items

- a) History on where the Oversight Committee came from. Faculty from each campus, BOV, BOT and different disciplines to bring as many different perspectives to the table. Committee to react. Communicators in from and out to their groups.
- b) What do we anticipate for the future?

- i) Reviewer of round 2.
- c) What is the current role?
 - i) No authority for approvals but to give input
 - ii) November's meeting was great.
 - iii) Is this an oversight or advisory group?
 - (1) Recommendation to change to advisory group to meet every 3 months**
- d) One more required meeting after r2 reports are in. After that, do we want to go towards another model.
- e) Thinks this group should stay intact for the communications to the people on the campuses
- f) Dave wants to encourage an ongoing role for this group but hold the space for VCAA that will be coming.
- g) Grog agrees with Dave. Invaluable. There is a whole lot more work that needs to be done. Process, procedures, successful cultures. Need to go on for another 18 months or 2 years.
 - i) Who is going to chair it?
- h) Advisory to whom? CAOs? Chancellor? BOT?
 - i) Ellen recommendation is Advisory to VCAA.
 - ii) Grog agrees
 - iii) Dana agrees
- i) Kate nominated to chair
 - i) Have discussion about membership going forward
 - ii) How do we learn from last 18 months?
 - (1) Involve some team leaders.
- j) Kate will lead next meeting.
- k) Charlie asked if we met our purpose. If we do transition to more of advisory group? How will our roles change?
- l) If taking on advisory role than communication might have to be changed a bit?
- m) Tamara could talk about communication review at next meeting.

7) Adjourn

Attachments: Revised Charter; Flow Chart; Quarterly Report to ASA