

STANDARD 3

ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

DESCRIPTION

Organizational Structure

“The University of Maine System is a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving approximately 46,000 students supported by the efforts of 1,377 regular full-time faculty, 113 regular part-time faculty, 3,376 regular full-time staff, and 416 regular part-time staff members.”

“The University of Maine System unites seven public universities in the common purpose of providing first-rate higher education at reasonable cost in order to improve the quality of life for the citizens of Maine. The System, through its Universities, carries out the traditional tripartite mission – teaching, research, and public service. As a System, it extends its mission as a major resource for the State, linking economic growth, the education of its people, and the application of research and scholarship” – UMS Board Materials.

Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees (BOT) of the University of Maine System (UMS) governs seven-campus in the state of Maine. Relevant system-level decisions are passed to the governing officers of UMFK including the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), Vice President for Administration & Finance, and Executive Director for Human Resources. The President meets monthly with other



System Presidents together with the Chancellor as the Council of Presidents.

A local Board of Visitors and a broad range of UMFK personnel, who serve on a variety of committees and advisory councils, are also involved in governance at the institutional level. The organizational structure is presented in table 2.5 in the *Faculty Handbook* (Appendix 3.01: UMS/UMFK Organizational Structure), which is also available online. The overriding goal of these formal structures is to establish clear lines of communication for advancing the mission of the University.

As described in the *BOT Policy Manual* (Exhibit 3.01), the BOT is the legal governing body for UMS. The BOT holds the property and assets of UMS and has final authority over all educational, public service, research and financial policies, and over the relation of UMS to the state and federal governments. The BOT is constituted of 14 members with 5-year terms, the Commissioner of Educational and Cultural Services, and a voting student member. Members are intended to represent the interests of residents across the State and are appointed by the Governor of the State. As we prepare for 2005-2006, the student Trustee is from UMFK.

UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual
<http://www.maine.edu/policy.html>

The BOT sets and reviews operating and capital budgets, tuition rates, and educational and research policy. The BOT appoints and evaluates a Chancellor who serves as the Chief Administrative and

Educational Officer of UMS and who implements and manages the duties described below. Finally, the BOT advocates for higher education within the State of Maine and at the federal level.

The BOT's duties regarding the particular campuses include hiring and evaluation of the campus Presidents, review and approval of all programs at each of the seven campuses, and awarding of tenure. The BOT meets at least once each calendar quarter with Presidents, Faculty, and Student Representatives from each campus to establish and maintain communication between the BOT and the various campuses. The President routinely meets with the faculty and student representatives before each meeting to review the agenda and discuss issues impacting this campus.

System Office

The BOT operates through the System Office located in Bangor. With a staff of 142, it oversees UMS as a whole and offers System-wide services such as accounting, funds management, human resources, payroll, budget, auditing, and physical facilities (Exhibit 3.02: UMS Charter Statement; Exhibit 3.03: System-Wide Services, University Network, and University College Profile).

UMS Charter
<http://www.maine.edu/policysc102.html>

System-Wide Services
<http://www.maine.edu/oft/sws.html>

The System Office is currently working with the seven campuses to convert all administrative functions to the PeopleSoft® Data Management System. The first module, Human Resources, was implemented in 2003 and as of this writing, UMS and campus personnel are preparing for implementation of the Financials Module in July 2005. Completion of the total effort, "Project Enterprise" is slated for some time

in 2010. The goal is to facilitate data sharing and reporting system-wide.

UMFK President

Upon the recommendation of the Chancellor, the BOT appoints the President of UMFK as its Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The President is responsible for implementing plans, policies, and directives from the BOT and the Chancellor. The President is responsible for providing campus leadership and for cultivating its relationship with the public. The President leads the faculty, professional, and classified staff to accomplish the campus mission through established planning processes. The President annually sets goals and reports on their accomplishment to the BOT, the Board of Visitors, and the public.

The President meets weekly with a Cabinet that includes the two Vice Presidents and the Executive Director of Human Resources. The principal functions of the Cabinet in support of the President include: 1) It is the forum that brings together the senior administrators who report directly to the President in order to share information and status reports and to facilitate direction to senior administrators; 2) It serves as an important sounding board to test out ideas and explore a variety of options before decisions are made by the President; and 3) It is the place where plans and proposals are developed and brought forward by the appropriate bodies and committees and are balanced against limited resources and institution-wide priorities and mission.

Faculty

Faculty at UMFK play a central role in assuring the academic integrity of the institution's educational programs and policies. The governing structures through which this is accomplished include the Faculty Assembly, academic divisions, and various committees. Subject to the VPAA's approval, the Assembly determines

academic policies within the University structure and is responsible for the curriculum, instructional methods, degree requirements, and aspects of student life related to the educational process. The Faculty Assembly meets monthly and is led by a Faculty Chair elected annually. The Faculty Constitution appears in section 5.2 of the *Faculty Handbook* (Exhibit 3.04).

Faculty members also govern through the institution's four academic divisions: Arts & Humanities, Education, Natural and Behavioral Science, and Nursing. Divisions consider issues related to academic programs housed in that division. Three academic divisions elect a Division Chair from its membership. The University President appoints a Director of Nursing to chair the Nursing division. The Chairs and VPAA comprise the Council of Division Chairs, which meets every two weeks to review budgets, initiate curriculum development, and conduct program reviews. Divisions are described in section 5.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* (Exhibit 3.05: Academic Divisions).

Faculty also govern the institution's educational programs and policies by participating on several standing committees. The Academic Council evaluates proposals for curriculum changes, reviews existing programs, and conducts periodic reviews of academic policies, standards, and procedures. The Honors Committee encourages advanced research skills in students by offering topical research seminars. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) guides the development and implementation of strategic planning and assessment programs on campus. Charters of these committees are presented in Section 5.5, 5.6, and 7.14 of the *Faculty Handbook* (Exhibit 3.06, 3.07, & 3.08).

Faculty assure the academic integrity of the institution also by their substantive voice in determining faculty personnel. On search committees, faculty make hiring recommendations to the VPAA. As

members of the Peer Review Committee, faculty make recommendations for faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Division Chairs conduct annual reviews of faculty performance. Faculty roles in the Search Committee, the Peer Review Committee, and as Division Chairs are described in sections 5.8, 5.4, and 3.19, respectively, of the *Faculty Handbook* (Exhibit 3.09, 3.10 & 3.11).

Union Representation

Six state-wide Associations represent State University System personnel:

1. The Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System, MEA/NEA. The current agreement runs from July 2003-June 2005. Among other things this agreement specifies that campus faculty "shall participate in the selection of teaching faculty, including part-time faculty."
2. The Maine Part-Time Faculty Association, American Federation of Teachers Local #4593 AFT-Maine, AFL-CIO, September 2003-August 2005.
3. Teamsters Union Local #340, Police Unit, July 2002-June 2005. UMFK has one individual, a night security guard, in this unit.
4. Teamsters Local #340 Service & Maintenance Unit, July 2002-June 2005. This includes buildings and grounds personnel, skilled trades, and dining services employees (other than employees of Aramark, our contracted provider).
5. University of Maine Professional Staff Association, Professional and Administrative Unit, July 2002-June 2005.
6. Associated C.O.L.T. Staff of the University of Maine, Clerical, Office, Laboratory and Technical Unit, July 2002-June 2005.

Negotiations with the various bargaining units are conducted by bargaining teams of System and campus personnel led by the UMS Labor Relations Staff (Exhibit 3.12: Labor Relations Agreements).

Ancillary Educational Programs

UMFK offers distance education via interactive television (ITV) and on-line courses, as well as evening and weekend classes (Exhibit 3.13: *UMFK Semester 2005 Course Guide*). Governance of these courses occurs under the leadership of academic divisions, which are subject to the same policies and procedures as are traditional courses.

Students

Student governance is the domain of the Student Senate, a student government structure comprised of 16 elected members who meet on a weekly basis. The Student Senate nominates students for appointment to various committees, coordinates cultural and social functions, and allocates student activity funds. With the Student Services Office, the Student Senate encourages the development of activities and student organizations on campus (Exhibit 3.14: Student Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Minutes).

UMFK Board of Visitors

Boards of Visitors were established at each of the seven campuses by public law in 1997. Visitors are tasked to: “1) advocate for the university, 2) raise private funds for the university, 3) advise the head of each campus on community and regional needs, and 4) review for final recommendation to the BOT, tuition increases, new academic programs, and the 5-year plan of the University.

The board consists of up to 20 members recommended by the campus President and confirmed by the BOT. The UMFK Board

of Visitors has included about 15 members and the membership slate created in 2004 will increase membership to 20. Quarterly meetings are held in January, April, July, and October.

The Consortium

The *UMS Strategic Plan, 2004* adopted by the BOT calls for the creation of a consortium of campuses including Fort Kent, Presque Isle, and Machias. According to the plan, each of the institutions will have “a President, a board of visitors, its location in its name, a clearly defined niche or specialized program area, athletic teams at each campus, its identity recognized and acknowledged by the BOT, and foundational liberal arts courses.” Details concerning the implementation of this plan were discussed throughout the spring of 2005. As of March 2005, one element of the plan, the proposed merger of the University of Maine at Augusta into the University of Southern Maine was postponed to permit legislative review of the proposal.

Evaluation of Organization & Governance

The President, in consultation with the Cabinet, evaluates UMFK’s organization and governance annually. Any revisions are reflected in the annual publication of the UMS/UMFK Organizational Structure (Appendix 3.01). Since NEASC’s last visit, UMFK’s governing structure has been substantially modified twice, once in 1999 and again in 2002.

APPRAISAL

Organizational Structure/Board of Trustees

Relations with the BOT and System Office in recent years have been generally good.

Approval of three new buildings since the last NEASC visit and routine approval of campus recommendations for tenure and honorary degrees have demonstrated a strong level of mutual trust and respect.

The impact of a top-down strategic planning proposal for UMS during 2004 strained this relationship, but the fact that campus visits, testimony, and discussions with campus leadership led to substantial modifications of the initial draft has established a basis for continued work together.

The *BOT Policy Manual* (Exhibit 3.01) describes the division of responsibility and authority between UMS and UMFK, and this division is widely known. The BOT retains authority for administrative and academic decisions and UMFK retains the authority to make administrative and academic decisions regarding how it will operate within the guidelines established by the BOT. System policies are also clearly stated in the *BOT Policy Manual*.

The President of UMFK meets monthly with the Chancellor as a member of the Council of Presidents. Chief Academic Officers and Chief Financial Officers also meet routinely with the appropriate Vice Chancellors and their peers from UMS campuses.

UMFK President

At the institutional level, UMFK's organizational structure suits the University's needs well. Communication for advancing the University's mission flows freely across organizational structures. The number and inclusiveness of the various administrative components has been well honed as conditions have changed on campus. The relationship between system-level and institutional-level governance is likewise suited to facilitate communication across these levels.

UMFK has endured a crisis of leadership since NEASC's last visit. In the past 10 years, the President's role has been occupied

by four different individuals and the VPAA's role by five. The responsibilities of our longest sitting former President during this period were split between UMFK and the System Office, who charged him in 1998 with moving UMS forward in delivering community college education to Maine while still sitting as President of this campus. Although UMFK maintained its integrity as a center for higher learning during this time, it was less progressive in the service of its mission than it has been since it regained a President in 2002 focused solely on the mission of UMFK. Since 2003, UMFK has experienced a period of unparalleled growth in enrollment and campus facilities.

Faculty

Faculty governance structures operate in a generally effective manner, and it is commonly recognized that through these structures, faculty play a substantial role in assuring UMFK's academic integrity. However, problems in the operation of these structures have been periodically identified and only some of these have been corrected.

The "Faculty Assembly" was created in 1995 and its governing responsibilities codified with a faculty constitution (Exhibit 3.04). Prior to that time, the governing responsibilities of the faculty as a unit were largely assumed.

The *Faculty Handbook* (Exhibit 3.15), which identifies faculty responsibilities in all faculty governance structures, was revised in 1995 and again in 2004. Between these revisions, a serious hindrance to effective faculty governance was that no office was responsible for updating the *Faculty Handbook* even though the Faculty Assembly was ratifying revisions on a regular basis. In the spring of 2004, the Faculty Assembly delegated that responsibility to select faculty members who compiled and inserted the revisions from the previous nine years into an online *Faculty Handbook*. Placing the handbook online

increases the ease with which future revisions can be made.

Faculty governance of the Elementary and Secondary Education Programs was lacking prior to 1998 when creation of the Education Division gave faculty control over a division budget, curriculum, and promotion and tenure standards.

A number of committees through which faculty govern also face problems, many of which can be traced to an underlying, broad confusion over the distinction between their academic and administrative functions. For instance, the Academic Council and Division Chairs commonly disagree over whether changes in academic program policies are the purview of the Council (Exhibit 3.06: Academic Council Charter, section 5.5, responsibilities), 2b) or the Division Chairs.

A significant limitation of the faculty governance structure, collectively, is a lack of coordination and communication among the various committees as well as between the administrative-governance structures. It has not been uncommon at UMFK that academic policies are revised with substantial faculty input, but without the awareness of other faculty governing bodies. For instance, over the summer of 2004, the members of the Academic Council decided to eliminate the finals week. The faculty at large, however, did not become aware of this significant policy change until a revised semester calendar was released only months prior to the start of classes. A partial solution to the problem of coordinating and communication across the faculty governance structure involved the creation and on-line publication of an academic policy-change log by the current VPAA. Faculty can visit the website to learn what academic policy changes have been made by faculty and administrative governance structures (Exhibit 3.16: Policy Change Log).

Policy Change Log Website

www.umfk.maine.edu/academics/aapolicylog

Ancillary Educational Programs

In their proposal and development, distance education (ITV and on-line) courses are governed by the same policies and procedures as traditional courses. The courses must meet the same standards of traditional courses as well as be taught by qualified faculty. However, in the offering of distance education courses, a need has been identified to increase structure or oversight.

Students

Students at UMFK enjoy a high level of awareness of and participation in the governing of matters relevant to them. In the context of a small campus, the Student Senate and student organizations offer students ample opportunity to make their opinions and judgments known. On occasion, the process is formalized by Student Senate presentations to faculty at Faculty Assembly meetings. Finally, student participation in organizational and governance matters is often solicited by inviting student representatives to vote in various committees such as the Library Advisory and Faculty Search Committees (Exhibit 3.17: Committee Composition Including Student Representation, Faculty Handbook, Section 4.5 & 5.8).

UMFK Board of Visitors

The UMFK Board played an important role in representing the needs of this campus and of this community in public discussions concerning the *UMS Strategic Plan* during 2004. The law establishing the Visitors states that the local Boards will meet once a year with the BOT. These meetings have not occurred.

Evaluation of Organization & Governance

Evaluation of UMFK's organizational structure occurs on a regular basis. The process has identified problems with previous structures and guided restructuring to accommodate changing conditions on campus. With increases in the student body, for instance, assessment revealed that student demands for services and financial aid were increasing beyond the ability of a single Dean to meet them. In 1999, the Dean of Student Services and Financial Aid was replaced by a Director of Student Services and a Director of Financial Aid, both overseen by a Vice President for Administration. However, neither the evaluative procedures themselves, nor the gathering of data that inform evaluation of governance are systematic. Further examining the need for a systematized approach to evaluating the effectiveness of the institutional system of shared governance could benefit campus planning and decision-making as well as improve institutional effectiveness.

PROJECTION

Beyond the usual replacement of its members as members' terms expire, changes to the structure of the BOT or to its role in UMFK governance are unlikely. One possible course of change may be in the relationship between the BOT and campus faculty. The latter have expressed a desire to share the role of system governance with the BOT (Exhibit 3.18: Faculty Strategic Plan Summit Recommendations). This proposal followed the release of the BOT's original Strategic Plan, which recommended dramatic and sweeping changes to organization and structure of UMS.

Faculty Summit Recommendations
<http://www.maine.edu/spp/facsumm.pdf>

UMS has maintained a steady growth in size, spending, and assumed responsibility

for the past five years. This growth is projected to continue with the BOT's current emphasis on centralizing services through Project Enterprise (PeopleSoft[®] implementation scheduled to take place through 2010).

A period of stable leadership over the coming years is anticipated now that a permanent, and wholly committed, President has been chosen to lead UMFK. Changes neither in the President's duties nor in his relationship to other governing bodies is anticipated at this time. The decision to retain the President's office in Cyr Hall and to continue an open door policy suggests a continuation of a traditional community atmosphere at UMFK.

As described above, faculty play a substantial role in assuring the academic integrity of UMFK. In the future, that role may be even larger. Faculty on campus have proposed that they participate with administration in the shared governance of UMFK the same way UMS faculty at large have proposed to share governance of UMS with the BOT (Exhibit 3.19: Faculty Assembly Minutes 9/10/04; Exhibit 3.20: Faculty Chair Letter to President of 9/15/04). To improve communication, the President's Cabinet will meet monthly with two faculty representatives and the Director of Student Services (Exhibit 3.21: President's Letter to Faculty Chair of 9/24/04). This is new, but promises to be useful. In addition, the Campus Council, which includes Division Chairs and Directors, the Dean of Library and Information Services, and Academic Support Unit Directors, has been re-established to serve as a forum for general discussion. In the future, it is anticipated that communication will continue to improve on many levels.

In addition, it is projected that the faculty-governing structures that currently exist will be better coordinated and that the communication between them will flow more freely. This is the anticipated

consequence of two recent changes. First, documents relating to the administration of academic matters were moved to an on-line platform. For example, the *Academic Affairs Policy Log* and the *Faculty Handbook* increases the availability of that information to the various faculty-governing structures. However, a faculty member responsible for updating the online *Faculty Handbook* needs to be designated annually. Second, the IEAP, while designed primarily for assessment purposes, mandates a flow of communication between groups on campus including faculty as well as administrative governing groups. These changes should increase the awareness of what other groups are doing and of their own responsibilities and so may help to resolve, as well, the confusion by faculty over whether their policy decisions are the purview of faculty, staff, or administration.

We anticipate that student involvement in committees that make governing decisions will continue to be high, consistent with the small community atmosphere of this campus.

An increase in the number of regularly offered on-line general education courses is anticipated. Increasing the number and coordinating the delivery of these courses is one of the charges given to the new Coordinator of Distance Education and Academic Outreach. The Coordinator will also configure an advisory committee.

The Presidents of the three Consortium campuses have been in active discussions throughout 2004 and 2005. Chief Academic Officers are working with Division Chairs and Faculty and many faculty members have begun discussions with their counterparts at participating institutions. Chief Financial Officers are working with their counterparts to look at administrative issues.

The three Consortium Presidents are working with a consulting firm engaged by UMS to plan two “Appreciative Inquiry” summits to develop goals for the

Consortium. While the focus will be on the Consortium, we believe this inclusive planning model represents a decision-making style especially well suited to small campus governance. The first of these sessions was held in May 2005, which brought together cross sectional teams of 15 persons from each campus and generated a great deal of enthusiasm and many follow-on projects.

The success of our governance structures will be evaluated by the extent to which all elements of the campus community feel engaged in determining campus direction and success.

