

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|---|------|--|-----------------|
| Q1. What do you like about the new Appropriation Allocation Model? | | | |
| n/a | Like | The budget allocation model stresses "fairness" over strategy. There is nothing strategic about bringing all seven campuses up to the average of its peers. | |
| n/a | Like | This is a much appreciated step forward since there is acknowledgement that the historical approach to state appropriation is badly outdated and that some campuses have been significantly underfunded. | |
| n/a | Like | We are finally recognizing the specific needs of the institutions and not using an historical model for funding. | |
| n/a | Like | I think the use of peer institutions combined with our own metrics provides a broader approach that we can benefit from not just in terms of scale, but also see how other institutions have allocated limited resources. | |
| UM CLAS | Like | Generally, the model was well received and your clear explanation of it was much appreciated | |
| UMF Pres Council | Like | We are impressed by the care and attention to this process, appreciating deeply at least three visits to UMF to share the model as it evolved. Each time we understood it better. | |
| UMF Pres Council | Like | We understand and support the logic of the parity calculations to avoid jolts in allocations as monies flow through the model. | |
| UMA | Like | I think it's a fair assessment using like institutions as comparisons. | |
| UMA | Like | Based on objective data and restores a level of parity to underfunded campuses | |
| UMA | Like | We're getting closer to a student-based allocation model. | |
| UMA | Like | It a more fair model | |
| UMA | Like | The balance of factors considered across the peer groups | |
| UMA | Like | It's well thought out and logical. Provides for change without causing shock. | |
| UMA | Like | UMA which has been underfunded now appears to be receiving an increase which will help the institution perform better. | |
| UMA | Like | I appreciate the approach, the transparency and the adjustments made to allocate more equitably across the system. | |
| UMA | Like | It divides future appropriations more equitably among campuses, so that those campuses that have been historically underfunded will be allocated more resources. | |
| UMA | Like | It seems to correct many years of inequity. | |
| UMA | Like | That it recognizes the UMA has been underfunded for many years and proposes a solution to rectify that situation. | |
| UMA | Like | I like the it shows all of the campus names, except for UMA! | |
| UMA | Like | The model takes into account head count and enrollment status to determine need for services whether that be faculty, library services, etc. This is much more equitable. | |
| UMA | Like | It values UMA's uniqueness and provides more appropriate funding. | |
| UMA | Like | That the allocation for UMA is higher than it has been historically. | |
| UMA | Like | It more accurately reflects a fiscal balance between the institutions. | |
| UMA | Like | That it attempts to even the playing field; addressing some much needed adjustments to the current distribution of funds. | |
| UMA | Like | This is a better distribution of new funds for all universities. It will benefit the system as a whole. | |
| UMA | Like | It is trying to get UMA's financial allocation more in line with it's peers. | |
| UMA | Like | It seems more fair to UMA given the campus responsibilities. | |
| UMA | Like | It represents a measured and fair process for reallocating funding that is fair to all campuses. | |
| UMFK | Like | The fact that it is based on data and uses peer institutions for comparisons. | |
| UMA | Like | It seems like a data driven process that is objective and not driven by bias toward any of the UMS many missions and educational objectives. The final conclusions look to help the most disadvantaged students--the very students that need the most services. Additionally, the model doesn't take money from other institutions, but balances appropriations gradually. | |
| UMA | Like | It seems to be a more balanced approach. I appreciate that it uses actual data around cost of instruction and enrollment. | |
| UMFK | Like | The model attempts to fund via a logical matrix of factors. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|------|--|-----------------|
| UMFK | Like | The chance for smaller campuses to gain more financial support from the system. | |
| UMFK | Like | I like that the comparison of cost is based on a similar institutions and increases UMFK's funding. Our funding model has chronically under-resourced UMFK by 20-30% or more for decades. I hope this will allow our institution to hire more faculty and staff to address the extreme overload everyone on this campus works under. | |
| UMFK | Like | the campuses that need the most help will get the help regardless of their size | |
| UMFK | Like | That the amounts given to each campus will be based on actual calculations of what is needed. | |
| UMFK | Like | It is a more equitable formula. | |
| UMFK | Like | It addresses the current needs of campuses across the entire system. | |
| UMF | Like | I like that is bases the allocations on a mathematical model rather than "historical" funding levels. | |
| UMA | Like | The increased parity allocation to UMA. | |
| UMFK | Like | Provides a fairness of how money will be shared among the University of Maine System. | |
| UMA | Like | It recognizes the financial need of UMA students and the historical under-funding of their education. | |
| UMFK | Like | Use of peer institutions as models for allocation levels | |
| US/UMS | Like | very colorful | |
| UM | Like | Was glad to see improved comparatives to other universities that were a superior match than those originally put forward. This made for a fairer allocation. | |
| UMFK | Like | N/A | |
| UM | Like | UM has been underfunded due to the existing model. This model better awards success. | |
| UMFK | Like | I like that the new model brings our funding more inline with that of peers. | |
| UMFK | Like | The Appropriation Allocation Model takes into effect the different expenses and factors per campus when distributing funds. | |
| UMFK | Like | Very detailed, informative. UMFK and UMPI are given the same appropriation allocation. | |
| UMFK | Like | That it may be more evenly distributed than in years prior. | |
| UM | Like | I like that it is well drawn out so we can see what the allocations are. | |
| UMFK | Like | It will FINALLY make an effort to close the gap and bring our campus to a more appropriate funding level over time. | |
| UMA | Like | must fairer distribution of state funds | |
| UM | Like | Appears to be evidence based, at least insofar as I can understand it | |
| UMA | Like | The degree of transparency and campus consultation (e.g. process). The outcome is (unfortunately) obtuse. | |
| UM | Like | Seagrant should be similar peers need to be on a great lake or ocean with a long coast 4000 miles for Maine | |
| USM | Like | Seems to be equitable | |
| UMFK | Like | It brings equity in allocation based on today's campus status, not that of the 1950's. | |
| USM | Like | I felt the old approach artificially inflated Orono and this model seems to slowly adjust in a more fair distribution | |
| USM | Like | Still learning more about it, but feel it will be in the best interest of all schools within the system. | |
| UMFK | Like | That it is equal for UMFK to receive the appropriate amount of Allocation as compared to the other campuses. | |
| US/UMS | Like | the elimination of the historical approach | |
| UMFK | Like | Better equity | |
| UMFK | Like | Fairer allocation of funding to the smaller campuses. | |
| UM | Like | Very well organized and very well costly | |
| UM | Like | Prioritizes funding for institutions leveraging more external support | |
| UMFK | Like | Comprehensive | |
| UM | Like | More fair than outcomes based funding and ensures that we receive our equitable share of the increased funding, if successfully obtained | |
| UMFK | Like | That the measurements include more than headcount or credit hours. | |
| UMFK | Like | It's a more equitable model. | |
| US/UMS | Like | I see some slight funding increases for some of the campuses. | |
| USM | Like | it's about time! fair distribution | |
| UMFK | Like | The new appropriation model is thorough, well-thought out and allows for a more equitable distribution of the UMS funding. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|------|--|-----------------|
| USM | Like | The end goal, but less so the means | |
| UMFK | Like | The potential for more funding. | |
| UMFK | Like | It appears to have been well researched and will allow for more equitable distribution of UMS funding amongst campuses. | |
| UMA | Like | Adjusting the allocation model is a step towards providing more equitable funding to all institutions, rather than continuing the previous distribution "formula" that was established when the UMS was formed 50 years ago. Higher education has changed significantly since 1968 and its important that the funding be adjusted accordingly. | |
| UMA | Like | It will provide UMA an opportunity to come closer to its comparator institutions. | |
| UMFK | Like | I think that the new model is more equitable. | |
| UMFK | Like | It seems more fair. | |
| UMA | Like | This model provides UMA with a greater amount of fiscal equality in the system than it's experienced previously. | |
| UM | Like | There has obviously been a lot of thought put into the model. | |
| UM | Like | It appears that costs are being adjusted. | |
| US/UMS | Like | Shared information available in one file to review comparisons along with the Data | |
| UMA | Like | The new model recognizes that UMA is, and always has been, underfunded. It was long thought that adult students didn't need as many services as younger people. In fact, they often need MORE. Service delivery to adults is usually one-to-one, and rarely in a group setting. | |
| UMA | Like | Continues to recognize the budget shortfalls by continuing the work of OBF. | |
| UMPI | Like | The fact that there is now a recognition that the funding model needed to be revisited and that action is taking place. | |
| UM | Like | Headcount allocation for academic support. It is a bit closer to better support for the land grant/research institution. better than the outcomes based funding which had UMaine funds going to the other campuses. | |
| UM | Like | More explicit about factors included. Hard to fully understand from just the slides (didn't attend presentation). | |
| UMPI | Like | I do like the fact that a concerted effort is being made to look at how the different campuses are or should be funded | |
| UM | Like | No more outcomes-based funding. Rational approach that can be transparently explained. | |
| UMA | Like | It is thoroughly researched and well documented. | |
| UMF | Like | It seems a bit complicated and based how how different universities code items in different categories used for financial allocations. It seems that schools that don't code in the same manner as UMaine and USM suffer. | |
| US/UMS | Like | I feel as though it is a more balanced approach. | |
| UM | Like | I like that it is optimistic about increases in available resources for all campuses in the future. | |
| UMA | Like | It recognizes more fully and effectively the nature of UMA's student body, and how we differ from our sister institutions. | |
| UMA | Like | The current model more accurately represents UMA's position in the UMS. | |
| UMA | Like | I don't really know much about it. So that's nice. | |
| UMA | Like | I like that a good you are retaining a lot of the funding for student services. These are important services to thousands of students | |
| UMA | Like | No comment | |
| UMA | Like | This is a well crafted, balanced approach to fund allocation. The use of peer analysis in its development adds confidence to the end result. | |
| UMA | Like | The process is more transparent and simply evolving the model is historic. | |
| USM | Like | It may address historical shortfalls for campuses. | |
| UMA | Like | I think it is a reasonable approach. | |
| UMA | Like | Data-centered, analytical approach to allocation | |
| USM | Like | Seems to take into account many types of expenses to determine allocations. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|--|-----------------|
| UMA | Like | You need to have more \$\$\$ allocated to trade careers AND technology System Analyst, DBAs, Project Managers, Business Analyst, we are flying non-Americans from half way about nd the world via H1B Visas and they are taking our good high paying jobs. | |
| USM | Like | There is a plan to rebalance the budget for each campus based on Student FTE and programs. | |
| UMA | Like | What I appreciate most about the new Appropriation Allocation Method is that it provides a possibility for conversation about the deep disparities of funding provided for higher education within the University of Maine System, while drawing attention to the public availability of IPEDS data for a number of institutions of higher education. | |
| UMA | Like | It treats my campus more fairly, which every other allocation model has failed to do. | |
| UMPI | Other | Thank you for your efforts with this important project. | |
| UMA | Other | I feel we should move towards the new Allocation Model. | |
| UMA | Other | The Appropriation Allocation Model is a thoughtful and thorough process that should be followed. | |
| UMFK | Other | Good job. A lot of work. | |
| UMFK | Other | I fully support this model and know that it will greatly impact to provide needed services and facilities to our ever changing student body. | |
| UMF | Other | This is a more fair allocation model, one that is based on the key variables that drive costs. I appreciate the efforts of all those involved in advancing this model. | |
| UMA | Other | Great new changes! | |
| UMA | Other | It's a good, objective approach. Maintaining appropriate peer groups over time will be an important discipline — matching each Campus based on mission and goals to drive a future state rather than current needs. | |
| UM | Other | no, it's apparent that a substantial amount of work and effort has gone into this. Thank you for your efforts. | |
| UMA | Other | I fully support the implementation of the new Appropriation Allocation Model and hope the Board of Trustees see the ability this model provides for us to invest in underfunded campuses. | |
| UMA | Other | I am glad to see an approach that adds to the "smaller" Universities in the System. | |
| UMA | Other | I am very pleased to find UMA will finally be getting an increase in support. I work as a student retention specialist, and I find myself and our school as underfunded as the population we serve. In order to fulfill our state-wide mission, and actually answer the call to the people of state of Maine, we must be better supported by the System. Thank You!!!! | |
| UMA | Other | Thank you for this massive undertaking and for the various approaches and resources that were used. I truly believe that people were careful, thoughtful and inclusive in this process. Again - thank you. | |
| UMA | Other | No, other comments. The model should be implemented as presented. | |
| UMA | Other | No.....I want the thank the committe for thoroughly looking at the Allocation Model. | |
| UMA | Other | I am pleased that there seems to be more consideration of campuses that have greater need. | |
| UM | Other | If it will help higher education to get a more reasonable appropriation from the legislature it's a good idea. However, I'm not hopeful that will happen. | |
| US/UMS | Other | No, it looks like they did the best they can with the resources available. | |
| UMA | Concern | None...it gives credit for the type/nature of students that UMA serves. | |
| USM | Other | I LOVE the format of this survey. The fact that you can clearly see its length and future/past questions/answers as you work on the current bolded one but you can go back and make changes makes it literally the best online survey I have ever seen. | |
| UMA | Other | Just a firm congratulations! And Thank You! | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|---|---------|--|---|
| UMA | Concern | No, concerns. This is a fair way to move forward with new funds. The model provides as level a playing field as could be obtained, give the diversity of the universities. | |
| UMA | Other | Thanks for your great work! | |
| UM | Other | I appreciate the effort to tackle these thorny issues. I hope that we continue to work toward a model that supports building a stronger UMS as we move forward, not just "equal". | |
| n/a | Other | We deeply appreciate the work that has gone into this and hope that the approval process goes smoothly. | |
| n/a | Other | Appreciative of outreach and efforts to share, explain, field questions and have the process be as inclusive and open as individual employees and colleagues would like to make it. Like politics, we all benefit from engagement and involvement. | |
| UMA | Other | Thank you for the many hours I'm sure you've all spent poring over spreadsheets and missions statements. This certainly was not an easy task! | |
| UMA | Other | we appreciate the effort here! Wish there was a balance in OBF along with the new allocation model to provide some short term injection of funding | |
| UMA | Other | Nothing particular. I appreciate the campus presentation by Mr. Low. It was very informative. | |
| UMF | Other | This is a complex situation and I think, all things considered, this model has some good strengths. If allocations are adjusted as school start using common coding, I can see where schools could be "more competitive" for allocations. | |
| UMA | Other | I'm just grateful for the due diligence and thoughtful process to recognize a more fair and equitable allocation. | |
| UMA | Other | Thanks to the team who took on this effort. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Q2. What are your concerns or other comments about the new Appropriation Allocation Model? | | | |
| ONLY NEW APPROPRIATION - SLOW TO CHANGE | | | |
| n/a | Concern | This formula based methodology is neither strategic or the answer to solving sustainability issues for UMS or individual campuses. Parity across campuses is achieved only after a very long period of time and depends completely on overall growth in state appropriation to UMS. If there is no overall growth in appropriation to UMS then movement toward parity doesn't happen and chronic underfunding for some campuses continues. And how would any cut or curtailment in state appropriation be managed? Can underfunded campuses sustain themselves for another half decade or more while the model slowly adjusts to parity? Demands from the marketplace are moving quicker than what the model can do to react. Will underfunded campuses continue to lose competitiveness from lack of resources over the next 3-5 years? While the model is a great step in the right direction... is it too little, too late? | 1. See Documentation on how appropriation reductions will be managed but, in general, campuses that are the most underfunded would receive less of a curtailment - i.e., the model does not want to undo progress we are making on parity when curtailments occur. 2. We understand the concerns expressed regarding that movement towards parity is based on new appropriation; however given the difficulties experienced through the shifting of base appropriation between campuses, it was felt the model would be most successful in being accepted if current base \$ were not reallocated. New Appropriation has been received during the past decade |
| n/a | Concern | I worry that it is not being implemented quickly enough. If we are flat funded over the course of a couple of years, this model will not serve our historically underfunded institutions. | |
| UMA | Concern | It relies on external funding to increase which may or may not happen. | |
| UMA | Concern | UMA is has the largest disparity factor in funding and is severely underfunded currently. Why is the base funding not re-allocated more equitably among the campuses? | |
| UMA | Concern | That it will only be implemented if additional funding is appropriated by the Legislature, and that it may take many years to bring fairness to the appropriation allocation system. | |
| UMF Pres Council | Concern | if the proposed appropriation allocation model improves on the base model, it isn't used for more than simply new money. It is uncertain at best to imagine new monies of significant magnitude to offset the base model. We suggest consideration of using the proposed allocation model not only for 100% of new money, but also some percentage of base funding -- say 15% or a graduated increase as with OBF -- starting in FY20. | |
| UMFK | Concern | The dependence upon additional State funds. | |
| UMA | Concern | Availability of new stat funds. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|---------------------|---------|--|---|
| UMA | Concern | Concerned that its not going to roll out fast enough to impact campuses who have current financial challenges | |
| UMA | Concern | 1. It only applies to new money and that is an infrequent occurrence. 2. It won't help UMA to get closer to other UMS institutions. | |
| UMA | Concern | No new money means no new funding; UMA students often need more intensive support than "traditional" students. | |
| UMFK | Concern | UMFK is not getting enough funding | |
| UMA | Concern | The rate of parity allocation increase may not be sufficient given the challenges of providing higher education opportunities to the UMA student base which is non-traditional, often working, and less prepared for college that most UMS students. | |
| UMFK | Concern | That is is only applied to new funds and new funds these amounts are unknown | |
| UM | Concern | It will take several years before we reach our appropriate funding level | |
| UMA | Concern | Completely relies on the State to provide us with new appropriations...which we know hasn't happened in 10 years. | |
| MODEL REVIEW | | | |
| UMA | Other | I hope this system, if implemented, will be continually reviewed and revised as needed. | New data will be loaded annually and a team will review the model every 2 years. |
| n/a | Other | BOT should plan for a formal review of the model in three years. Where is each campus relative to its peers? Has this redistribution of new appropriation had any impact on key indicators: e.g., enrollment, retention, graduation rates, research productivity? Has it had unintended consequences? | |
| UMF Pres Council | Other | We propose an annual workshop with campus presidents, CBOs and other constituents to review the outcomes and revisions, if any, from the appropriation allocation model. To date, all the presentations have been campus-specific, which has limited cross-campus conversation of this One University effort. | |
| UMFK | Concern | That there be a set review period included in it, say on a 3 or 5 year period. It should not be allowed to stay in play with no review for decades. | |
| LAW SCHOOL | | | |
| n/a | Concern | What about the law school? Its peer institutions are different than USM's peers, yet its state funding seems to be wrapped up in USM's funding? Also its model is different, more expensive, etc...seems like it should have different funding, or perhaps USM's funding should be increased to cover it? I'm not in administration and know admittedly little about how the budget is allocated between USM and Law School but it seems like an important issue that wasn't addressed in the power point. | Each campus made the determination of which institutions were their peers. To favorably make an adjustment for the law school, the model uses 12 credit hours = 1 fte rather than 15. |
| USM | Concern | The Law School remains a subset of USM. | Outside Project Scope |
| ADOPTION | | | |
| UMA | Concern | none- other than the likely advocacy to minimize the impact on campuses that don't fare as well under this model. | Will be presented to BOT at the July 2018 meeting |
| UMA | Concern | That it might not be adopted. | |
| UMA | Concern | That it will not go forward as it is | |
| PEERS | | | |
| UMA | Concern | The comparable institutions for UMA seem less similar than they are for all the other campuses (with the exception of UMM). UMA is the only school to not have a single institution with a variability score of less than 0.1. | |
| UM CLAS | Concern | Although the peer group for UMaine does not seem controversial and the mission of UMaine itself is likely to remain stable, we wondered about how developments at the other campuses would affect subsequent peer selections and consequently allocations. In the past five years, USM has designated itself a "metropolitan" institution, UMPI has identified with competency-based education, UMFK has focused on early college, etc. These various approaches to educational mission entail different costs and benefits, and it is not clear to us how the allocation model might respond to what could be significant changes over a relatively short time. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| UMF Pres Council | Concern | In hindsight, we think it would make sense to designate an ideal number of peers, say 7, and enable campuses to vary only by 1 off of that ideal, i.e., 6-8 peers. In the absence of such guardrails, there is now a range from 6-10, which creates a different statistical situation, notably when there is missing data. We suggest pushing campuses to land on an ideal of 7 peers, if possible. o UMF originally put in seven peers and then at the last minute changed it to ten, thinking that it would be statistically superior (lower chance for extreme numbers to alter the outcomes) to have more. We're sorry we did, as the last three added do nothing but diminish UMF's "performance" against peers. Not surprisingly, we are keen to understand the rules to alter peer lists and would suggest that each school could alter one peer a year to get toward the ideal number of peers. | A change has been incorporated in the model to address these issue - see documentation on peer changes |
| UMA | Concern | That in the future schools will attempt to select peer groups that improve their allocation | See documentation on process developed for future peer selections based on this and other feedback. |
| USM | Concern | Don't understand how the peer universities were selected. | They were selected by each campus |
| UMA | Concern | UMA's chosen peers aren't really comparable. Additionally, the costs of living in Maine are higher than in a number of the so-called peers' regions. | National CPI & HEPI data was used to address the geographical cost of living. |
| UMFK | Concern | need to be able to control how and when a campus can change their peer institutions. | This has been addressed - see documentation |
| USM | Concern | On slide 3 - the "Base" 2020 is not explained...is it 70% historic + 30% OBF or something different? Some questions regarding the peer identification and similarity scores: 1. Were any peers for any institutions manually eliminated, or rank manipulated? 2. Are the components of the "similarity score" identical for each institution or did the variables selected differ. 3. What is the algorithm used to determine the similarity score? | Base 2020 will be 70% historical, 30% OBF, plus any new appropriation from the State. For Q1&2, peer selection was made by each campus and reviewed & approved by the Presidents' Council. After receiving this feedback, we requested algorithm information from Hanover ; however, they may consider this information proprietary. |
| UMFK | Concern | I am mostly concerned about our particular (UMFK) comparison made to Black Hills State University. This is the most comparable university in the model and has a large research budget. However, due to the way that budget was reported to the electronic system, Black Hills State University was excluded from the calculation for research money allocated per faculty, thus greatly decreasing the resources proposed to come to UMFK. I am a researcher here at UMFK and had to build my program from the ground up. I received no start up funds and had very little to no available research funding. Research drives innovation and provides experience and training at the highest levels for undergraduates who work in my lab as well as in the labs of colleagues. These experiences are often the most valuable in terms of training for the student and determining their job prospects immediately after graduating or their prospects for graduate school. By not including Black Hills State University, our most similar school, in calculating research, the UMS is ignoring and stifling the importance research dollars play in our education. | For this particular sample sited, the standard deviation for the UMFK research peers ranges between \$525-650K. We are using a 2.5 standard deviation to eliminate any extreme outliers. UMFK's peers range from \$0 research to 525K excluding Black Hills - which spends between \$1.8M and \$2.2M. In each year of the model, 2.5 standard deviation would be \$1.6 to \$1.9 - so Black Hills is outside of the range of other peer institutions. A 2.5 deviation is applied to all campuses and functional expense categories. The research costs in the model are only those funded through unrestricted sources and does not reflect funding from state & federal grants or private sources. |
| UNDERSTANDING THE MODEL | | | |
| USM | Concern | I was not able to attend a presentation and really do not understand the new model from looking at the slides. | Please reach out to a team member or review the video presentation & documentation on the thinkmissionexcellence website. Multiple presentations were made at each campus. |
| UM | Other | I don't really understand it since I was unable to attend any of the meetings. | |
| UM | Other | I looked at the presentation available online for my campus. It would take me too long to decipher it without having been present at the presentation and without a cheat sheet for reference. Therefore, I don't understand the Appropriation Allocation Model, and will not answer the above questions about it. I suggest a 1-2 page cheat sheet to accompany the presentation that states clearly in small paragraphs and bullet points: 1) what is the new appropriation allocation model; 2) how is it different from previous models of this type; 3) why do we need it; 4) what are the major positive and negative implications to my campus. | |
| UM | Other | A PowerPoint is not a report. I do not know how someone just reviewing the slides could understand the information and process. If a report cannot be written for some reason at least have notes on each slide to provide an explanation. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|---|---------|--|--|
| USM | Like | So hard to understand without explanation it's hard to know what to like. | |
| UMF | Like | I have heard nothing about it except that it exists, and whenever I try to listen to a system leader or read an email about it, it tells me nothing. | |
| USM | Like | I can't comment on this because the PowerPoint deck does not explain the allocation model adequately | |
| UM | Like | I am not sure. As I did not attend the presentation and I am only looking at the link, it is not clear what is going on. | |
| UM | Like | I cannot figure out the model from the slides in the presentation | |
| US/UMS | Concern | I find it difficult to follow | |
| USM | Concern | I dont understand it | |
| US/UMS | Concern | Confusing. | |
| UMA | Concern | I don't understand it. | |
| UMA | Other | Am I supposed to know about it? If so, could the needed information be presented more comprehensively? Cut the rhetoric, and give it to me straight doc. | |
| USM | Other | This was a waste of time. Tour the campuses to provide live demo and explanation. Why is Orono always shown as UM, while others by location? Should be UM-Orono if we are all parts of a whole, but funding has always been weighted to favor Orono, though USM is nearly the same size. | Campus naming convention is a concern outside of this project's scope. |
| EARLY COLLEGE and/or HEADCOUNT MEASUREMENT | | | |
| UMFK | Concern | Whether or not Rural University students are taken into account when head count is tallied | The Allocation Team had many discussions on how Early College students should be represented in the model. At the end of reviewing all the feedback and each of our discussions, our recommendation continued to be that Early College students should be included in the model just as any other student - both credit hours & headcount. |
| UMFK | Concern | I'm concerned that some campuses wish to exclude Early College credits from the model. All students taking credits at an institution need the same support and services, thus expending resources. Therefore, Early College credits should remain included in the model. | Early College participation is one of the top educational priorities for the State of Maine & UMS Trustees. The State allocated \$3M to help grow Early College on a one-time basis. Additionally Universities are only compensated for Early College at approximately 50% of tuition (depending on the University). We can't guarantee quality instruction, course design, oversight, assessment, and student success without proper funding. Early College courses will be delivered with the same academic rigor, quality, and some even delivered at our Universities. |
| USM | Concern | USM won't get the monies it needs to be an excellent place for high school students to go get a secondary education. | To eliminate or change the way Early College studens are included in our model, it could result in possibly a \$3M reduction in the estimated State need. While some universities with lower early college enrollments do not support their inclusion in the model and/or their inclusion in student headcount measurements, their concerns may change in the future as their own Early College enrollments increase. |
| UMFK | Concern | That not all the factors, especially Aspirations and Dual Enrollment Students will not be just-fully counted within the Model. | We are not making a special distinction between part-time & full-time when considering headcount; therefore, we recommend that Early College students be treated in the model just as any part-time student. All the administrative duties necessary for a full or part-time student are also required for Early College students - and in many cases, those |
| UMFK | Concern | Early college and dual enrollment headcounts should be included in the allocation model. These students require resources on campus including support in IT, library, Distance Education, registration, billing, program administration, and faculty salaries. | processes are manual and thus more costly. These students have access to library materials, tutoring, proctoring, and instructor assistance. Blackboard LMS support is necessary. Dual enrollment students have all the same associated costs as other Early college students as well as costs for faculty mentoring, travel, etc. |
| UMFK | Concern | The inclusion of Early College and Dual Enrollment Headcounts Into the Appropriations Calculations. | Other state models had included a "small campus initiative" to recognize campus fixed costs that were not directly related to level of enrollment. After much discussion, the team recommended to include |
| UMFK | Concern | early college and dual enrollment headcount MUST be included in the new UMS appropriations model | Early College in both FTE and Headcount measures as a replacement for designing a small campus initiative. |
| UMFK | Concern | We need early college and dual enrollment to be included in the headcount. | We did receive feedback from other campuses with smaller Early College populations that recommended Early College counts be |
| UMFK | Other | The question has come up about the use of Early College headcount or not. This is a priority of the State and used in other measurements so I think it needs to be kept in the formula. | excluded from the model or calculated in a different manner; however, in the future as those campuses grow their Early College enrollment, |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|------------------|---------|---|---|
| UMFK | Other | Given the current as well as future costs of administering all categories of early college, as well as the percentage of early college students which attend either on-line or on-campus just like every other part-time student, including the early college headcount in the funding formula is absolutely imperative. | they will benefit by the inclusion of Early College students being included in the model's FTE and headcount. |
| UM CLAS | Concern | We are concerned about using student headcount rather than FTE. We understand that for some functions a student is a student, regardless of the number of credit hours. Broadly, though, the level of engagement of a student seems to us to track pretty well with full- or part-time status; students who are taking more credit hours are more engaged, use more services, and cost more to support. By relying on headcount, the allocation model could over-allocate to institutions with more part-time students who are less engaged, and under-allocate to those with more full-time students who are intensively using campus services. We would continue to advocate for an FTE-based approach to counting students, perhaps with another factor to incorporate headcount in the minority of circumstances where that would be appropriate. | |
| UMF Pres Council | Concern | Our most significant concern relates to the decisions noted on these slides. We oppose the use of student headcount for any of the cost centers to which it is assigned. The logic is straightforward: there is meaningful variation between kinds of students and that variation matters greatly in accounting for campus expenditures by cost center. Equating a full-time residential student, a non-residential graduate student, a part-time online student, and a dual enrollment student is misguided and undermines the integrity of the model. It is *not* the case that these students similarly draw on academic support (libraries, international programs, deans), student services (admissions, financial aid), facilities (utilities, custodial), or institutional & admin support (business functions, HR, development). (In this latter case, in fact, students hardly come into play in significant ways in most of these functions; employee or alumni numbers are more germane.) Rather their intensity of use is quite different. It's no wonder, then, that UMA, with significant share of part-time, non-residential students, and UMFK, with a high proportion of Early College students who never touch the campus, fare so well in the draft model. | |
| UMFK | Other | Early College and Dual Enrollment headcount NEEDS to be included in the overall headcount of a University. While both programs generate important income, they also require resources on campus - IT support, Library, Distance Education, Registration Services, Billing Services, Program Administration and Advising, and Faculty Involvement. Additionally, while UMS monies will initially support initiatives to reach NACEP accreditation, campuses will need the ability to sustain those initiatives past UMS financial support. At UMFK, Early College and Dual Enrollment headcounts make up a significant portion of our enrollment. It is exceptionally important for headcount to be included in the new UMS appropriations model for the sustainability of our fiscal well-being. | |
| | | The most robust solution would be to weight students by category based on the intensity of use. For example, 1 full-time residential student might equal 4 part-time, non-residential students, 4 part-time grad students (note that full-time, residential grad students would be equated as 1:1) or 20 Early College students. Recognizing the complexity of making these calculations, a less robust but more efficient calculation would be to simply use student FTE in place of headcount in all instances. It isn't perfect, but does reflect the intensity of student use of campus services and facilities and would thus be more legitimate credible, and fair in allocating resources. It would also be similar logic as is used in the proposed model for instruction and financial aid. | |
| UMF | Concern | I'm concerned that campuses will try to manipulate the variables to increase their allocation. I'm also concerned that dual enrollment students are given too much weight in the model. | |
| UMFK | Other | I would ask that the dual enrollment student be included in calculation of FTE for UMFK funding. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|--|-----------------|
| UMFK | Other | Please include early college and dual enrollment students in the headcounts for appropriation. This is critical to get an accurate assessment of financial need at UMFK. | |
| UMFK | Other | Early College and Dual Enrollment students do bring income to the campus, but also cost the campus in way of faculty, IT staff, Distance Ed and student support so they need to be considered in the calculations. | |
| UMPI | Concern | The single most concern I have is the use of Dual Credit course work in the new formula. The actual direct cost of providing these credits is significantly lower than the cost of a traditional course so considering those credits one for one is extremely misleading. I would suggest taking dual credit out of the calculation or at the very least prorate the credits (20%) – 5 Dual Credits equal 1 Traditional Credit. | |
| UMFK | Other | I propose that the model includes all early college students within the calculation. After reviewing all the expenses, wages, and supplies that UMFK services for these early college students, it would be unethical to dismiss these students within the total head count. | |
| UMFK | Other | I RECOMMEND FOR THE INCLUSION OF EARLY COLLEGE AND DUAL ENROLLMENT HEADCOUNTS INTO THE APPROPRIATIONS CALCULATIONS. | |
| UMFK | Other | It is extremely important to include the early college and dual enrollment students in the headcount. These students are just as important as all our other students and our services are made available and used by them. | |
| UMFK | Other | Early college students (of all varieties) bring real costs to campuses and should be counted and valued in the same way as degree seeking students. Institutions working to implement early college programs are responding to a real need and strong political pressure, and in doing so help UMS to be seen in a more favorable light by state legislature and executive branch. | |
| UMFK | Other | High school students taking college classes at UMFK should be counted in enrollment. | |
| UMFK | Other | Please include the early college students in the total headcount of students taking classes. | |
| UMFK | Other | Only that smaller campuses be fairly recognized for all the students they help through their Rural University contributions in getting more high school students to achieve a college education. | |
| UMFK | Other | The high number of Early College students on the UMFK campus has really stretched some of the support services areas. These students are integrated into regular college class and require/receive the same support - IT, Tutoring, on-boarding.... In addition, since these student are integrated in regular campus courses, access to academic resources such as library databases and Turnitin count these students in the headcount when we negotiate prices. | |
| UMFK | Other | Please DO include Early College and Dual Enrollment headcounts in the overall headcount for each campus in the new appropriations model as campus resources are required to continue with these programs which contribute to college enrollments AND MORE IMPORTANTLY to overall success, retention and graduation rates of Maine youth. | |
| UMFK | Other | I fully support the inclusion of early college students and dual enrollment headcounts into the appropriations calculations. | |
| UMFK | Other | Please include Early College and Dual Enrollment headcounts for each campus in the new appropriation model as campus resources are required to continue with these programs which contribute to college enrollments and more importantly to the overall success, retention and graduation rates of Maine youth. This is very important for the further of the country. | |
| UMFK | Other | I think that it would be of benefit to count Early College students in our total enrollments as this does create work on our campus, increased our credit hour generation, and demonstrates collaborative effort with state of Maine high schools. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|---|---------|---|-----------------|
| UMPI | Concern | The biggest concern that I have is that I am not sure that all the mitigating factors are being taken into consideration in regards to dual credit/early college enrollment. Are the campuses that have the largest head count for enrollment being funded according to headcount only or are the faculty/program cost also being factored in? The cost of delivering high school/dual credit courses is significantly less than than the cost of delivering on campus or online courses. | |
| UMFK | Concern | It is a concern that Dual enrollment students won't be considered in head counts for each campus. These students are still using our resources and graduating with real credits. They call the business office with questions on their bills, the community ed office are enrolling and dropping them from courses and putting grades in. | |
| UMFK | Concern | Early college and dual enrollment headcount MUST be included in the new UMS appropriations model. While early college and dual enrollment generate important income, they also require resources on campus including support in IT, library, Distance Education, registration, billing, program administration, and faculty salaries for courses taught by our faculty (such as those taught in the Pleasant St. Academy). In addition while UMS monies will initially support initiatives related to moving all early college programs toward NACEP accreditation (faculty/adjunct oversight of high school faculty, dual enrollment assessments, and discipline specific professional develop) campuses will need to sustain those initiatives in the future. | |
| UMFK | Concern | Head count needs to include all students being served. For example, at UMFK early college and dual enrollment do generate important income, but they also require resources on campus including support in IT, library, Distance Education, registration, billing, program administration, and faculty salaries for courses taught by our faculty (such as those taught in the Pleasant St. Academy). In addition while UMS monies initially support initiatives related to moving all early college programs toward NACEP accreditation (faculty/adjunct oversight of high school faculty, dual enrollment assessments, and discipline specific professional develop) campuses will need to sustain those initiatives in the future. | |
| UMFK | Concern | UMFK's early college/RuralU population is left out of the calculation. These students are serviced by many of our departments on campus and should be included in enrollment headcounts. | |
| UMFK | Concern | That early college students are will not be included in the headcount. | |
| UMFK | Concern | Early College and Dual Enrollment headcount not being considered. | |
| UMFK | Concern | I am concerned that Early College and Dual Enrollment students may not be considered in the appropriation calculations. These students need to be counted in order for our universities to continue serving them. | |
| UMFK | Concern | Not enough parity from smaller campuses to larger ones. Our buildings are decrepit. I also must strongly emphasize that early college and dual enrollment headcount be included in the appropriations model, as these student are a tax on our resources and staff. | |
| UMFK | Other | Important to count our Distance Education, Rural U and Pleasant Street Academy students. They all are dependent on our services for support. Many of these studetns do come on to campus to attend classes and seek out staff for assistance. Lets imagine all these students in one room and telling them that they don't count in our formula in allocating funds. Imagine how you would feel if that was you being told that you don't matter in the big picture of things. Imagine this being your son or daughter getting this message. These students are important in the big picture for a number of reasons. One being that this is an opportunity to inspire them to continue their college experience either with the university they started with or to move on to another University of Maine system. Lets not leave them with a bad taste by saying that they don't matter. | |
| UMFK | Concern | Important to look and our student numbers, even if they are off campus students because they need support services just like our Matriculated students. | |
| OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF TEAM'S CHARGE | | | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|------------------|---------|---|--|
| UM | Concern | I don't like the whole premise of having a centralized UMS budgeting process with decreased campus control. From what I've heard, there are a lot of aspects that have just added work, staff, and bureaucracy and have slowed up routine processes. | The feedback in this section pertains to items that were beyond the scope of the Allocation Model Team's charge. |
| UMF | Other | We should separate the campuses into individual universities, and eliminate the system level of administration. | |
| USM | Other | Rather than investing in bricks and mortar needs to be resources dedicated to online programs | |
| UM | Other | PLEASE, PLEASE, allocate enough money for us to have a paper phone directory. They are extremely useful, especially when the system is down. Not everything should be streamlined by computers and dehumanizing the UMS. | |
| n/a | Other | Still spreading limited resources too thinly. Maine will never rise to its full potential for research and education as long as we spread too few \$ among to many campuses. We all know that the REAL issues are and these "bandaids" only serve to prolong and preserve mediocrity. | |
| UMA | Concern | I attended school at Machias, and I have always had concerns for their future. It's a great school and I hope a reasonable compromise can be found. | |
| UM | Other | Understanding the political consequences of closing campuses, how long will shrinking campuses continue to receive funds which could be better utilized by successful campuses? | |
| UMA | Other | Vote Democrat so we can get some better funding from the state level. My parents could work the summer and pay for a year's worth of college. | |
| UM | Other | I would ask the Board to consider what UMaine has taken on in the partnership with UMM and how much of the overall revenue UMaine brings in before approving an allocation model. | |
| UM CLAS | Other | It was not clear to us how the progressive incorporation of the Machias campus into the UMaine organization would be accounted for in the model | |
| UMF Pres Council | Other | We wonder why UMM continues to get the same nature and magnitude of state appropriation as it did before entering the primary partnership. When would the UMS anticipate realizing the financial benefits of the partnership through economies of scale and other job sharing? It appears there remain seven campus cost centers rather than six as was anticipated by the partnership. | |
| USM | Other | it would be really wonderful if people whose position it is to assist with budgeting, funding and financing were actually available to do just that rather than requiring faculty (who may be very bad at such things) to do it. I spend hours each week trying to figure out budgeting | |
| UMA | Other | LESS FREE \$\$\$ for people that can't pay - can't pay, find a job and then go to college - no more free rides. GET RID of liberal progressive agendas on ANY campuses- you are ruining our education system- not recommending college to anyone- telling them to get a job and skip the liberal colleges, no longer learning anything of value at colleges any longer AND WAY TO EXPENSIVE! | |
| UMA | Other | The trustees should request a special appropriation to adjust the base appropriation allocation of the campuses most impacted by the model in order to remedy the unfairness earlier. | |
| UMA | Other | Hire more learning designers and hold programs accountable to certain web-design features within the learning management system that allow the eLearning experience to be branded in a recognizable way regardless of course. In other words, a student should be able to navigate between courses in a program on Blackboard and not feel like they are in five completely different schools in a single semester because each of her five courses is navigated differently than the others. | |
| USM | Other | I think the next step needs to be to ask what we want our universities to do for our state. It seems to me that we need to put resources into universities that attract and retain Maine residents. Both new Mainers and existing. Our demographic challenges need to front and center in terms of where we spend our state revenue. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|----------------------|---------|---|--|
| UM | Other | It's time for someone to speak truth to legislators and the population of the state. Hard decisions need to be made and the process of delaying those decisions makes processes like the development of the new appropriation allocation model a bit trivial, when considered in terms of the next 10 to 15 years. | |
| UMA | Concern | Not so much the model, but instead the current state of education funding in general. I'm worried that there will NOT be additional funds to allocate. | |
| UMF | Concern | That I will come to school one day and find the campus shut down because someone in Bangor thought it could save money. | |
| UMA | Concern | For the UMA campus it shows the Richard Randall Center rather than a UMA sign like all the other campus' ! | Feedback has been forwarded to appropriate individuals |
| UMA | Other | Show a UMA sign like all the others! | Feedback has been forwarded to appropriate individuals |
| USM | Concern | Just that changes up or down in budget might be mishandled (making cuts to 'save money' that actually end up costing more money or spending new funds on frivolous expenditures instead of things worthy of maintaining getting necessary investment) | This model is to be used only for the distribution of appropriation and as a tool to help make a case for more appropriation. It should not be used to influence budgeting. |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | | |
| UMF Pres Council | Concern | Slide 3: Allocation Model Background: We seek confirmation that the new "base model" allocation reflects the combination of the historic allocation (70%) and OBF (30%) and is not a return to the historic base (100%). That is, the base allocation remains the 30% OBF adjustment plus permanent allocations of \$1,000,000 to UMFK and UMM. | The new base model as shown in Slide 3 does NOT reflect a return to the historic base of each campus prior to OBF. |
| UMF Pres Council | Concern | UMF needs to look more carefully at how it reaches these conclusions given how different its percentages often are from campuses that are similar in other ways. We again request information on how other small campuses categorize expenses to reach their outcomes for research and public service. We suspect our categorization is off, so having the insights from others would be helpful. o Given how this share is used in the model, it is important to have consistency in method for all categorization and calculations. This is another rationale for asking for a meeting of all campus representatives, rather than a campus-only presentation. | The definitions of expense categories are in IPEDS (and the glossary included in the model documentation). The definitions are also available from NACUBO as part the "FARM" manual. These are definitions that have been used for a number of years in both IPEDS reporting and audited financial statements across the US. |
| UMA | Concern | UMaine Machias and its relationship to UMaine and whether or not it should even be represented separately since UMaine is using its facilities and overseeing the campus. | The team is not aware that UM is using UMM facilities. Currently they maintain separate financial statements. |
| UMA | Concern | UMaine still somehow gets almost 50% of allocations, while having 38% of the students (according to the 2016 UM data book and UMS site) | The allocation is based on peer costs. All institutions have costs that may not directly correlate to the % of students. |
| UMA | Concern | I think other campuses that were deemed to be overfunded will be upset about the new allocation model. | Currently, no campus is overfunded based on additional feedback changes that have been made to the model. |
| UMA | Concern | Some of the criteria are based on full time students rather than headcount. This may disadvantage UMA | Only instruction is based on FTE students; other costs are calculated based on headcount |
| UMA | Concern | First, the fact that all UMS need more financing....and UMA might lose some of the additional financing. Second, that this will take time. | This model does not reduce the appropriation of a campus to increase another's. |
| UMA | Concern | UMA students are disadvantaged, again, with this model. We have some of the most financially needy students in the system, and yet other schools' students have higher appropriation. | This model is based on the average education & general costs of each UMS institutions's peers and the desired % of State appropriation. One of the cost components is Scholarships. If UMA's peers award more E&G financial aid than UMA, this cost factor would be included in the calculation of appropriation for UMA |
| n/a | Concern | There are occasions when such allocation methods in terms of percentages, numbers, etc. run afoul of extenuating circumstances and keeping that in mind moving forward may be important to both avoid difficulties, but also seize opportunities as well. | The Board of Trustees may, at any time, set aside appropriation to be used for strategic initiatives. |
| UMFK | Concern | I'm concerned on where the new funding will truly go, and if disparities among the campuses will grow, or shrink. | The funding will be distributed based on the model's methodology and formulas. Disparities among campuses will change due to: 1 changes in peer costs 2. Changes in UMS enrollment 3. amount of appropriation received. |
| UM | Concern | It is not showing the cost of the "System Office". That is a huge expense and we need to see how that plays into the entire budget. | This model looks at the cost of our peers - not our own costs or budgets. Campus administrative costs would be included for peers who are not part of a system or those peers that have System administrative services or other forms of overhead allocated |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|---|--|
| UMA | Concern | Unfortunately when one campus "wins" another campus loses. Despite people saying we should not be in competition with each other the fact remains that we are all competing for the same pool of students. It is unfortunate that the State does not fund higher education appropriately. | Based on peer costs and UMS current funding levels and enrollments, campuses that are the most underfunded do receive more; however, base appropriation from prior years is not reduced and shifted to another campus |
| UMFK | Concern | Without a clear model for adapting to future changes, this could become just as outdated as our current model. | Currently the model is adaptable to change in enrollments and peer costs which are the main drivers in the model. The model has already been adapted to reflect a change in IPEDS reporting. |
| UM | Concern | Only those with professor titles seem to be considered as full time faculty. Where do continuing lecturers sit? | Research and public service is calculated based on the peer costs multiplied by each UMS institution's # of full-time teaching tenured or tenure track faculty. Other faculty members are not included in the calculation of this cost. |
| UM | Concern | lack of recognition of research, the role of Extension at UM and that the prior model unfairly allocated money away from UM and this incrementally adjust based on difference from peer institutions. | Unlike prior model (OBF), this model will not take UM's base appropriation and reallocate elsewhere; only new funds will be allocated to achieve parity. This model does consider the research & public service costs of UM's peer institutions. |
| UM | Concern | My concern is the apparent reduction in UMaine's allocation. If I understand it, we receive 4% less, and also UMM receives 1% less. UM and UMM are now in partnership, so I would think that additional expense to UMaine would increase the allocation to reflect additional support. Overall it's a significant loss to the largest, most comprehensive campus that is now supporting an additional campus. | The institutions with the greatest disparity do receive the most appropriation in the earliest years of this model; however, as we move closer to parity, UM will receive more appropriation. Currently UM & UMM maintain separate financial statements; therefore, UMM expenses are not assessed to UM. |
| USM | Concern | Still too little goes toward facilities | Agree. UMS is looking to increase State capital funding through bonding |
| US/UMS | Concern | It is still pretty clear that most of the campuses are underfunded. | TRUE |
| UM | Concern | I like the idea of comparing peer institution spending but it is not clear from this document what the results are. | More detail is available in the detailed Excelmodel on the thinkmissionexcellence website. |
| UM | Concern | It appears that some things are being phased out | Outcomes Based Funding is being eliminated |
| UM | Concern | We are not at the funding level we need to be for support of the mission | The model recognizes that UM is underfunded |
| UM | Concern | It appears that all majors are treated equally with regard to cost/benefits. If so - that ignores the higher cost of education for majors such as sciences and engineering which have laboratory components and faculty with higher salaries. Since the Orono campus a much higher percentage of those types of majors - and so does not treat all locations equally. | All majors are treated equally in the model because specific information by major was not available in IPEDS. However, assuming that UM has selected similar peers, then the costs of sciences, engineering, etc., are also part of the peer data that is being used to calculate the desired UM appropriation. |
| UM | Concern | Dependence on peer information that may not be a great fit. Use of headcount rather than FTE as a student measure. Not clear how Machias/UMaine relationship will be accounted for. | Each campus was responsible for the selection of their peers. The model uses both Headcount & FTE depending on the measurement. UM/UMM relation is outside Team scope. |
| UMF | Concern | It also seems like after three years, the 75% of state appropriations goes back to two schools. It's difficult for 5 schools each work with 5% of the budget. It is not sustainable over time with the declining enrollments. | As the System gets closer to parity, the largest % of appropriation will go to the institutions with the highest enrollments. Institutions with declining enrollments may need to reduce costs to offset. |
| UM | Concern | I'm very concerned that Outcomes-Based Funding seems projected to constitute a very large portion of the system's operating budget very soon, yet very little information can be readily found on the criteria for judging those outcomes. What little I can find is several years old, vague, and presents many blind spots regarding what research productivity means. The OBF final report (2013!) from UMS's Think Mission Excellence page only lists contracts and financial revenue as metrics for research productivity. However, a huge proportion of the research undertaken at UMaine, other UMS campuses, and universities around the country has little to do with the capture of funding or the creation of new contracts. The general thrust of the proposed funding model seems to be to award the most vaguely-defined progress towards meeting short-term workforce needs in the state, a very narrow and short-sighted view of the university's function and stature in the state and the nation. | Outcomes Based Funding is being eliminated so no more appropriation after FY19 will be distributed through this formula. Research is one of the functional categories that is being considered in the new funding formula and new appropriation will be distributed based on UM's peers and their respective E&G research costs. There are other restricted sources of appropriation from the State and federal government plus 3rd parties that also fund research. |
| UM | Concern | That there is an assumption made that state support is only intended to support Maine students. The state support should be supporting Maine Universities, regardless of where the students attending those universities come from. | The tuition rate for Maine students is less because the state appropriation subsidizes the cost of those students since it is Maine taxpayers that generate the appropriation revenue. |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|--|--|
| USM | Concern | Were TRIO Upward Bound, Veterans Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Educational Opportunity Center pre-college grant programs included under public service? They were not mentioned and exist on USM, UMPI, UMF, and UMaine campuses serving 2,258 participants with \$3,491,501 in federal funding per year . Also I saw no mention of TRIO Student Support Services grant programs under student services/provost and they exist on all campuses except UMM, serving 1,420 undergraduate students with federal grant funding of \$2,259,513 per year. | Any departments funded through federal or other grants are not part of this funding formula. The formula is looking only at E&G costs which are funded with a combination of unrestricted revenues such as tuition and appropriation |
| UMA | Concern | I hope that in the future you might allocate even more to student services and assistance. | The allocation is based on peer costs and the number of students enrolled. |
| UMA | Concern | This model appears to merely protect existing structures rather than predict and support potential innovations that could encourage student enrollment growth and retention. Likewise, distance education poses a significantly higher return on investment IF funded appropriately with clear wraparound, seamless support services for students and a strong and engaging instructional design that gives the students a powerful online learning experience that feels like a unified brand across courses within a program. This can't be done without investment in distance FTE upfront as a separate focal point that is then used as a template for all learning experiences so, above all else, students can know and recognize they are experiencing the self-same program whether it is online, hybrid, or on-campus because elements of the experience carry over between modalities across the brand. | Because the model includes measures for headcount, this can potentially increase appropriation to campuses with distance education programs or adult student populations who are not enrolled full time. Increased enrollment can result in increased appropriation. |
| UMA | Concern | It will continue to widen the gap between the 'haves' and 'have nots' and reduce quality education for the latter group. | By addressing parity in the model, the goal is to have all campuses funded at the appropriate levels. |
| USM | Concern | I wonder about the math of applying a "discount" to ensure funding goes to in-state students when that discount wasn't part of the peer institution data. It seems like that will result in UMS campuses being automatically funded less than their peer institutions. | The model does not consider the level of peer funding from any source. It is looking at the spending of those peers and then make the assumption that if we received x% of those costs from the State, then the appropriation should be \$Y. |
| UMA | Concern | Make it simple, LESS for international non Americans- MORE for Americans paying for this via tax payer \$\$. | The model reflects that needed appropriation is calculated on in-state students only - not on out of state or international students. |
| UMA | Other | May need to have an alternate way to move the model forward if external funds do not come through. | TBD if necessary at a later date. |
| USM | Other | You are essentially asking for feedback on a bunch of slides with incomplete information. This conveys a lack of transparency, which is likely not the case, but you should probably issue a full report with a narrative. Peer selection, in general, is very susceptible to manipulation and tends to lead to allocations not informed by actual performance metrics. Full disclosure: I didn't attend the information session on the allocation so I'm not sure what was explained there. | Documentation and a video have been posted to the thinkmissionexcellence website to further explain the model |
| UMA | Other | Suggestion - diversify the membership of the group leading this effort. Comment - thanks for the effort and presumably good intentions. | Team is comprised of representation from 5 of the 7 campuses plus 3 System staff. There was a mix of both large & small campus representation. |
| UMA | Other | I wish the team preparing and presenting the Appropriation Allocation Model had indeed made available their full spreadsheets that generated the Model results. Instead, the team only described the general approach of its work. It is not possible to thoroughly evaluate the Model when the data and data transformations in the Model are not made fully available for review. The lack of transparency in this regard is disappointing and should not be repeated. I encourage the team to fully release all source documents, data and spreadsheets generating the Model for another round of full review; this would be the academic tradition of peer review in fullest flower. | The Team will be posting the full spreadsheets for review. This document was not originally distributed as we were seeking unbiased opinions on the methodology rather than individuals reacting to the final appropriation calculation for each university. |
| USM | Other | Continue to work to balance resources based on student FTE and academic programming needs for our students. | The model does consider student FTE & Headcount |
| USM | Other | Can't figure out if actual spending of each campus in each of the 9 areas was used at all, or if it is all based on peer institutions. | Completely based on peers |
| UM | Other | It is not apparent what can be done at the unit level in response to such a system. What unit behaviors will be rewarded? Being more explicit could have a positive influence. | The purpose of this model is to compare UMS university costs against their peers and to use that information to seek more appropriation and distribute new appropriation based on each campuses unfunded need. |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|--|---|
| UMA | Other | Throwing out skewed years is a part of the process that could be considered subjective in what goes and what stays when determining averages, and it was confusing partly because of time constraints. In any event, it may be a contentious issue. | To avoid subjectivity, we are applying a standard deviation with an upper and lower bounds equal to 2.5 standard deviations. 98-99% of all data is still included in the model. |
| n/a | Other | Address the scenario where UMS does not get the expected growth in state appropriation. Even with no growth in state appropriation, shouldn't there still be some reallocation of funding to help move UMS towards parity each year? Perhaps set an annual target \$ amount that would be committed to reallocation... regardless of whether or not the overall state appropriation to UMS grows. | The concensus was that the issue of parity would be resolved through the distribution of new appropriation. The goal is to hold campuses harmless (no campus gives up appropriation). |
| UMA | Concern | 1) the obtuse nature of outcomes; 2) the apparent invisibility the the distinctive requirements of access institutions heavily invested in online programming; 3) the shift to peer groups external to the UMS; 4) the over reliance of peers whose similarity is atypically low; and 5) the absence of information aligning allocation. | |
| UM | Concern | land bound states differ greatly from Maine | |
| USM | Concern | That is does not represent all the schools appropriately. | |
| USM | Like | I don't like anything about it. | |
| UMA | Like | Not much | |
| UM | Like | I don't. | |
| US/UMS | Concern | Accountability | |
| UM | Concern | No projections | |
| UM | Concern | Appropriate funding of other campuses | |
| USM | Concern | A few premises are too fluid: the past three years of enrollment data, the focus on undergrads (a BOT blind-spot), averaged benefits, etc | |
| UM | Concern | A couple of points for your consideration: 1) Slide 21 on the UMaine presentation depicts the state's suggested share for UGrad at 60%, and Grad at 40%. My concern is that professional graduate programs (e.g., MBA, CSD, Nursing, etc) do not typically have the same opportunities for grants as do research-based graduate programs. If UMaine is focused on building professional graduate student enrollment, the model has built in a 20% "penalty" for these programs. Instructional costs for professional graduate programs are more like UGrad than research programs. 2) The model appears to assume that our peers are at a level we should aspire to; if not, then we are not being strategic in our investment of resources. | |
| USM | Concern | We have concerns about the peer analysis and research cost calculation. First, the peer analysis is based on non-comparable research institutions (e.g. research portfolio size and scope; tenured faculty based models) and the calculation incorrectly utilizes USMs 3-year average of full time, tenured, teaching faculty rather than including the 160 professional staff researchers that are PIs on 90% of USM's research portfolio. The 207 tenured faculty have a separate portfolio of unfunded scholarship and creativity. Secondly, we are unable to understand how USM's research costs were calculated. We would love to have a discussion about comparable institutions, staffing and actual research costs to create an accurate calculation | USM was responsible for the peer selection for the campus which was then presented and approved by Presidents' Council. The model is using data that is readily available in IPEDS; therefore, the average research cost for the peers is then based on their average cost per full-time teaching tenure & tenure track faculty and then multiplied by USM's number of full-time teaching tenure & tenure track faculty. We do not have information on each of the peers and their professional staff involved in research. It is important to remember for research that the focus is on E&G sponsored research - i.e., excludes research funded with Federal/State grants or 3rd parties. |
| UM | Concern | It allows for structural deficiencies in the system. Places undue pressures on revenue generating operations on campuses that could be self sufficient. Prevents campuses with potential surpluses to address long term needs in order to keep other units afloat. It is irrational and simply pushes problems to the next generation of students, faculty, and administrators. | |
| UMA | Concern | That it will be fought by the bigger campuses. | |
| UMA | Other | We at UMA have always had to make do with very little. We have no residence halls, athletic facilities, or even a venue to get a snack on campus after 2 pm. Even with a more equitable distribution of future appropriations, we at UMA will still be severely underfunded compared to our sister campuses. If we are a truly unified system, these disparities must be eliminated so that all UMS students may have equal access to resources, not just those who are traditional age students on residential campuses. UMA students are the most likely to stay in their communities, spend their lives in Maine, and raise their families here. They work hard to improve their lives and they deserve equal opportunity to do so. | |

Complete Appropriation Allocation Model Feedback Survey Results Responses
July 2018

| Campus | | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---------|--|-----------------|
| UMA | Other | Please consider the needs of UMA students, who are often financially challenged. They are, as well, some of the hardest working of any I've taught. They come to classes after or before working, caring for children or parents or both. They are driven to improve their lives, the lives of their families, and communities. They are Maine's backbone. They deserve high attention to make our creative economy thrive. They are the future of Maine. | |
| UMA | Other | Because UMA is fiscally responsible, and we have "managed" despite being under-funded, I worry that the Board will interpret that as lack of need. There are louder campuses who may prevail, despite UMA's proven need (see Peer Institutions). | |
| USM | Like | Very little | |
| UM | Other | Move quickly. | |
| UM | Other | Maine has larger land and sea coast extent than the peers we are surrounded by Quebec and New Brunswick reducing connection to US | |
| UM | Other | Make clear comparisons with spending at Peer institutions. | |
| USM | Other | "University of Northern Maine" | |
| UMA | Other | Greater appropriations to UMA mean more support for our underserved students, who are mostly working women. | |
| UM | Other | I hope that whatever metrics for determining future allocations are implemented, they take a global view of the work done across the campuses, rather than define productivity in the terms of a few fields. Also, I hope those metrics are designed to reward work towards the long-term strength and vitality of the institutions, not the short-term perceived needs of the labor force. The programs we offer entering students cannot simply be a reflection of the labor shortages at the time those students enter. That kind of reactive and unstable structure will not serve them or the state when those needs change in a few years' time. | |
| UMA | Other | I STRONGLY recommend that both team members and Board members take the time to meet with faculty and staff IN SMALL and INFORMAL groups to listen/learn about (unintentional but clearly evident) harm that will result from identifying peer institutions only external to UMS. | |
| UMA | Concern | <p>The Appropriation Allocation Model is best judged according to whether it meets its stated goal. Helpfully, the Model goal is stated succinctly in a paragraph with the overt title of "Goal," in which two central terms are defined: 1. "'Parity' is the key concept of this model - as calculations are performed to determine the percentage that each UMS university is under- or over-funded as compared to the calculated needed State appropriation." 2. Need: "The goal is to distribute new appropriation to the universities based on the percentage of their current unmet need. The institution with the highest percentage of unmet need will receive the highest percentage of any new appropriation. Conversely, the institution with the lowest percentage of unmet need will receive the lowest percentage of any new appropriation." The Appropriation Allocation Model should therefore be judged by two simple questions: 1. Does the Model provide parity? 2. Does the Model distribute funds proportional to unmet need? Unfortunately, the answer to both questions appears to be no under reasonable definitions of "parity" (OED definition: "the state or condition of being equal, especially as regards status or pay") and "need" (OED definition: "a thing that is wanted or required"). The Appropriation Allocation Model does not either measure the need of each UMS campus or judge the equality of condition between UMS campuses. Instead, the Model looks at similar-tier institutions in other American states. This means that a first-tier state campus' need is judged according to what other first-tier campuses in other states do, a public liberal-arts campus' need is judged by what's typical at other states' public liberal arts campuses, and bottom-tier campuses' needs is judged by what other states provide their bottom-tier campuses. (cont)</p> | |

| Campus | Comment | Response/Action |
|--------|---|-----------------|
| | <p>Two problems are associated with this approach: 1. In its idea of "need," the Model assumes that spending at peer institutions for each UMS campus represent, in the aggregate, an estimate of appropriate spending for campuses of that sort. This is not a safe assumption. As the American Academy of Arts & Sciences' 2015 report "Public Research Universities: Changes in State Funding" documents (https://www.amacad.org/LincolnProject), nationwide state allocation for public higher education declined nearly 30% in real dollars from 2000-2014. Because most states' investment in their institutions of public higher education have plummeted in tandem, large unmet needs stemming from these funding cuts will be masked by the continued relative similarity of funding levels across states. In its idea of "parity," the Model rejects true "equal condition" parity in favor of a hierarchical, stratified, and unequal tiered system in which some tiers ought to have a different set of peers than others. If other states follow the culture in which "liberal arts" campuses are deemed worthy of higher instruction expenditure per student than "bottom-tier" campuses, then comparing "liberal arts" UMS campuses only to their "liberal arts" peers while comparing "bottom-tier" campuses only to their "bottom-tier" peers to determine "need" will guarantee continued disparity. The team constructing the Appropriation Allocation Model repeatedly pledged a public release of their Model's full spreadsheets containing the IPEDS measures for campuses and their peers. This pledge has not been met, unfortunately, and while it is not possible to judge the motivation for that failure to deliver upon the promise of a fully-transparent model, the result is clear: stakeholders seeking to evaluate the model will not be able to see a full comparison of the spending in various areas on each campus, a full comparison that would make very clear how</p> | |
| | <p>stratified experiences are for students at different campuses of the University of Maine System. A review of the last available year of final IPEDS data (FY 15) reveals the kind of problematic stratification that will not be addressed in appropriate scale by the Appropriation Allocation Model. According to that data, in FY15 the "bottom-tier" University of Maine at Augusta spent \$3,601 per student FTE on instruction wages and salaries; in the same year the "liberal-arts tier" University of Maine at Farmington spent \$5,310 per student FTE on instruction wages and salaries. This is a strong disparity that leads to real differences in education, including the fact that according to the same IPEDS data Farmington students are roughly half as likely as Augusta students to be taught by less-credentialed, poorly-paid, no-office-hour adjunct instructors. Yet if we judge whether UMA students' "needs" are "unmet" by comparing spending on instruction to that by UMA's peers, we won't see as large a difference, since UMA's peers on average spent \$4,158 per student FTE on instruction wages and salaries -- the portion of "unmet need" feeding the model for UMA is only \$557 per FTE compared to its bottom-tier appropriate "peers," not \$1,709 per FTE compared to Farmington. Farmington, in turn, appears to be overspending to "need" by liberal-arts appropriate "peers" by \$147 per FTE, because Farmington's peers on average spend \$5,163 per FTE. By focusing on tier-similar "peers," the largest source of inequality and disparity within the University of Maine System is obscured. The point of this example is not to pick out UM-Farmington as a campus and suggest it deserves less. Instead, Farmington was selected because, like UMA, it teaches primarily undergraduates. The example of spending per FTE on instruction was used because it is not matter of facilities like</p> | |
| | <p>dorms (which Farmington has and UMA has been denied) or research. When it comes to instruction, the matter of higher education is distilled. Nevertheless, for any kind of expenditure, we ought to be able to see the differences. Stakeholders then ought to be able to ask, "Why do students at THIS university in the system deserve less than students at THAT university?" And then there ought to be an answer. Such information, such questions, and such answers are not made possible in this Appropriation Allocation Model, and that's a significant problem for those interested in meeting unmet needs and reaching real parity.</p> | |