

University of Maine System
Board of Trustees Meeting

Zoom Meeting
March 9, 2023

Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Committee Members: Emily Cain, Chair; Barbara Alexander, Donna Loring and Trish Riley. **Other Trustees:** Kelly Martin and Mike Michaud. **Non-Voting Committee Members:** William Otto, Jeremy Chubbuck and Ray Rice. **Presidents:** Jacqueline Edmondson. **Staff:** Jeffrey St. John, Carolyn Dorsey, Ellen Doughty, Paul Chan and Kim Jenkins.

Absent: Lisa Eames and Roger Katz.

Trustee Cain, Committee Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. The Clerk performed a roll call of the Committee members present.

Initial Feedback on the First Draft of the Strategic Plan

Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs Jeffrey St. John provided the initial feedback from the first draft of the strategic plan. March 21st is the deadline for feedback on the first draft. The feedback form asks respondents to identify their campus affiliation and their role but not their name. The feedback will be anonymous. The tool invites feedback on the specific components of the plan: the vision statement, the defining unified accreditation statement, the introduction, the five core commitments, and the implementation section of the plan. The executive summary will be written in April as the plan itself is nearing final form.

Vice Chancellor St. John stated that as of Monday, March 6th, just over 1,000 members of the UMS community had clicked on the link in the Chancellor's February 28 email to review the first draft. 89 people clicked the link within that same email to submit feedback and 27 actually did submit feedback. He shared the following observations:

- Biomedical science is a broader, more encompassing term than bioengineering.
- Suggested that UMS draws on our master's in social work graduate students to augment our mental health resources, our mental health staffing, a practice that has been profitable elsewhere in the nation and is becoming a best practice. It's on the ground training for graduate students and MSW programs who are working towards degrees in that field.
- Feedback on specific wording
- A few very helpful suggestions for specific things that we might consider adding such as a direct reference to students with disabilities.
- Feedback from one person responding to the draft may help identify or address a gap identified by another person reading the draft. For example, a faculty member said that UMS needs to be thinking about specific goals for environmental sustainability and climate change and in a separate set of feedback, a staff member said that UMS should be looking at the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals as a possible resource in that area.
- Unified accreditation was raised in different ways – positively as well as negatively or not in support of the tool.
- A very small number of responses were uniformly negative.

A Committee member raised the issue that there were too many detailed action and goal items. It's important to do measurements, goals and objectives but it could be beneficial to have a high level version and leave the development of the lower level or detailed aspects to the implementation phase that will be developed after the plan is adopted.

Another issue raised was a concern from the smaller campuses about how courses being available at more campuses is ultimately going to work out because of the tension at a small campus related to how to make sure that those intercampus courses can still get offered and still serve the students on their campus. Also, the System DEI Committee may provide feedback on number four as it is related to addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Vice Chancellor St. John commented that they are working on another reminder for feedback that hopefully will be sent out before spring break. He also mentioned that there is a number of meetings coming up with faculty which will provide an opportunity to solicit their feedback in person. Concern was raised about the lack of potential mechanisms for students and alumni to provide feedback on the plan. In response to that concern, Vice Chancellor St. John stated the second draft will be distributed to students System-wide with a clarifying message. It was suggested that the campus Boards of Visitors, alumni associations and foundations should be included in an opportunity to provide feedback on the plan.

The second draft of the plan will be distributed to the Board on Monday, April 3rd with the second draft available for the public on Tuesday, April 4th. This is an aggressive timeline that is needed in order to provide the proposed final version to the Chancellor, Presidents, and Board prior to the May Board meeting. The Committee recommended scheduling an Executive Committee meeting in April to discuss the feedback on the second draft.

Presentation on the Proposed Implementation Plan/Process

UMS Director of Organizational Effectiveness Kim-Marie Jenkins provided a presentation on the proposed implementation plan/process. The proposed implementation model is called the balanced scorecard framework. It's simple in design, the essential elements can be seen on one page and as much or as little can be shared depending on the audience. It helps UMS identify how and where to invest our resources in the form of money and time.

UMS needs a model that will meet at least three requirements - manage strategy, measure progress, and communicate. It communicates what the organization needs to accomplish. It aligns the day-to-day work that everyone is doing with strategy. It allows UMS to stay focused and prioritize projects in products and services. It will help make data informed decisions by measuring and monitoring progress towards specific targets. It also provides line of sight and visible connections between projects and programs and our strategic objectives and mission in the strategy of the organization. It will also translate our strategic objectives into a set of performance indicators.

Ms. Jenkins explained that achieving balance is at the core of why the scorecard works. Balance must be attained among factors in three areas of performance measurement, external and internal constituents, financial and non-financial indicators, and lag and lead indicators. The lagging indicators are past performance indicators like revenue and customer satisfaction, because they've already happened, and those numbers are known. Leading indicators are the performance drivers that lead to the achievement of the lagging indicators. And the framework really helps us to become strong in all of these areas.

There are six elements to the balanced scorecard.

- The first one is communicating what is trying to be accomplished and there are four perspectives or views. There are different names for these views and can be named whatever UMS wants.
 - The first one is the financial perspective and the stewards or stakeholders. What is our financial performance? Are we using resources effectively? How do we look to trustees, the legislature, the citizens of Maine?
 - The second is customer-identified value satisfaction. If UMS were a company, would it be concerned with how they look to shareholders. The customer's perspective includes the customer identified value and satisfaction which translate to how do our students see us?
 - The third is internal processes. Here, UMS would strive for efficiency, quality, and improvement.
 - The final area is the learning and growth of all employees. What is the work culture like? Are staff engaged? Does UMS have the necessary infrastructure and technology to support them? The need for a balanced area will help UMS to sustain our ability to change, improve, and innovate. Having satisfied and engaged staff, employees, faculty is important for all of us.
- The second element is to align the day-to-day work with strategy which means the actions that UMS will implement to see the improvement in our strategies. They make abstract concepts actionable like mission and vision, even our core competencies.
- The third element is to stay focused and prioritize. It is the strategy map. It shows cause and effect connections between strategic objectives and how they align to the mission. It allows UMS to visualize and communicate. An example in the learning and growth area, could display how engaged staff can improve internal processes, which leads to better services for students and could lead to retention.
- The fourth element is to make data-informed decisions with goals, measurements or the KPIs and target goals.
- The fifth one is to provide line of sight and visible connections to the UMS projects, new and existing, short term or long term. These all need to be measured and managed just like any other project.
- The sixth element translates strategic objectives into performance indicators and creates a line of sight between the work that is done as an individual or specific group and how that work contributes to the overall mission of the organization.

A strategy map can take different shapes by using squares or circles and can be tailored to UMS. It should be simple and clear and having it outlined on one page is very helpful. Ms. Jenkins shared a few examples to display different concepts, discussed the common pitfalls, how to avoid them and the process of moving from strategy to action. Concern was raised about the implications of some of the slides in the presentations regarding measurements for individual employees. Ms. Jenkins responded by stating that the supervisor and an employee can develop goals and objectives which can lead to a larger mission. Committee members expressed great interest in a one-page summary document. A question was raised about how will the Board be able to measure the success of the strategic plan and how will the System strategic plan be integrated into the campus's strategic plans. In response to the question, it was stated that the campus strategic plans will be explicitly connected and in alignment with the System strategic plan. Having a System strategic plan in place will allow the institution to identify its priorities and the constituent's demographics and will serve within the larger structure of the System and its priorities. The Committee commented that it should be implicitly assumed that the campuses update their strategic plan following approval of the System strategic plan. A key element to the success of the scorecard will be socializing how it will be used because it's not necessarily

intuitive. To aid in the socializing of the implementation scorecard, Chancellor Malloy indicated that there will be campus visits scheduled for this issue.

Ms. Jenkins concluded her presentation by thanking the Committee for their feedback because after the implementation scorecard model is selected it will be difficult to pivot to a different model. UMS will need the structure in place at the beginning of the implementation phase to apply it evenly.

Additional information about the meeting can be found on the Board of Trustees website:
<https://www.maine.edu/board-of-trustees/meeting-agendas-materials/ad-hoc-committee-on-strategic-planning/>

Adjournment

Ellen N. Doughty, Clerk