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Preface

In January of 1976, Mr. James H. Page, Chairman of the University of Maine Board of Trustees, appointed an ad hoc Committee on Academic Planning to "review the operation of the University System since 1969 and to make recommendations about the future."

The members of the Committee named by Mr. Page were: Dr. Nils Y. Wessell, Chairman; Ms. Cynthia A. Murray-Beliveau; Dr. Winthrop C. Libby; Mr. Robert R. Masterton; and Dr. Elizabeth S. Russell. Mr. Francis A. Brown was named in June to replace Dr. Libby. Mr. Thomas F. Monaghan was named to the Committee in November.

This Committee of Trustees served as a group of concerned citizens, not as a panel of experts such as have presented planning and evaluation reports on the University in the past (Coles Report, HEP Report). From the start, the Committee worked closely with the Chancellor.

The Committee met monthly in various locations to review the available data, determine a general framework, outline the specific tasks and commission a series of studies on such subjects as health education, teacher preparation, and the Cooperative Extension Service; and seek statistical information regarding enrollment, admission, placement, course development and faculty.

The Committee determined the central question to be: How do we strengthen what is good, reward what is excellent, support what needs development, reduce what is unnecessary and eliminate what is redundant or weak, while at the same time maintaining the commitment to quality learning for the total University?

In November of 1976, the Committee submitted a Statement, \textit{Guideposts for the Future of the University of Maine}, in order to elicit public comment and response.

Comments were requested in written or oral form. Four regional public forums were held in Augusta, Presque Isle, Portland and Bangor. In addition, each campus was charged with responding to the Guideposts and meetings of Trustees, faculty, students and staff were held on each campus. Written comments were invited through mid-February.

The ad hoc Committee met with the Maine State Legislative Performance Audit Committee on several occasions during 1976. The Legislative Committee visited all of the University System campuses. A report was issued by the Audit Committee and their recommendations were given great weight by the ad hoc Committee. Transcripts of their report are available in the Chancellor's office and in the Law Library at the Maine State House in Augusta.
ad hoc Academic Planning Committee

Several thousand copies of the Guideposts statement were distributed and the response, much of which has enriched this Report, was impressive. Addenda, correspondence, statements, and similar material, including transcripts of the public meetings, are available for inspection in the Chancellor's office.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the many citizens of Maine who helped make this report possible. We hope we have been responsive to their views.
Highlights Of The Report

"The University System should continue to strive towards its goal of quality public higher education for Maine citizens.... The Trustees are committed to the reduction of barriers to access to the University System.... Our emphasis in this Report is upon bold coordination.... It is our view that the University has, since the 1968 merger, one mission, and that mission guides the System and its individual campuses."

- This University is a comprehensive institution. The Committee believes its academic programs for part-time students must no longer be regarded as falling into categories separate from undergraduate and graduate programs.

- The Committee believes improved opportunity must be sought for transfer from one campus to another and between programs.

- The Committee feels the centralization of planning program content for teacher-preparation at one location, a College of Education, could bring more logic and order to a discipline which, while diminishing in number of candidates, is vastly increasing in quality demands.

- The Committee supports the strengthening of the University faculty by reviewing salary schedules and delivery of definitive salary programs; seeking more funds to bolster salary schedules; supporting sabbatical leave; developing in-service programs; improving the general environment of learning and teaching.

- The Committee recommends that graduate degree programs be concentrated at Orono and Portland/Gorham. At the same time, there is a need to consider a plan for offering graduate studies throughout the State.

- The Committee looks forward to creation of a University-wide Degree as a long-term goal to permit the highly qualified student to experience the best of each or many of the campuses.
The Committee feels that the changing patterns of society, the economy and agriculture may require dynamic changes in the Cooperative Extension Service.

The Committee feels that the structure of the campuses should be under continuing examination, both as to effecting administrative mergers and to undoing them and recommends a thorough inquiry with regard to the administration of campuses.

The Committee supports a significant commitment to health science education including special attention to nursing, health education resources, allied health education and nutrition.

The Committee accepts the fact, barring any mandate from the Legislature, that we should not expend University energies and resources on the initiation of a medical school.

The Committee recommends that the concept of University Coordinators be implemented.

The Committee recommends that the Maine Public Broadcasting Network be placed on an equal policy basis with the seven campuses of the University. A Plan of Action should be prepared for the use of radio, television and microwave facilities to extend the academic activities of the University to a potentially large State-wide audience.

The Committee endorses the planning concept that each new activity should be subject to a termination date as well as evaluation to determine whether the activity is to be continued.

The Committee recommends that the implementation of change requires the active participation in policy issues by Trustees and suggests Trustee Subcommittees to monitor progress of specific recommendations.
Introduction

Basic to an understanding of the task that the ad hoc Committee of the Board of Trustees has undertaken in formulating this Report is an awareness of the distinction between a private and a public institution. One word, with many ramifications, best defines that distinction. That word is "access". The public institution has an obligation to strive to lessen the barriers to access that are common to so many of our private colleges. The public institution has an obligation to strive to serve all of its citizens, rather than a select population. It must strive for the highest possible quality. It must retain high standards and constantly seek to improve the intellectual fibre of its students through challenging courses and demanding programs.

The 103rd Legislature in 1968 passed two significant pieces of legislation. One created a state-wide system under a single Board of Trustees by merging the five state teacher colleges — Farmington, Gorham, Washington, Aroostook and Fort Kent — with the University of Maine at Orono and its branches at Augusta and Portland.* The other legislative measure adopted a statement of public policy on higher education: "All citizens eligible. To recognize that all citizens of Maine shall be considered eligible for the benefits of appropriate higher education whether they are high school graduates or the equivalent, or those seeking retraining or training for new careers."**

On numerous occasions critics of the present University system have emphasized portions of the legislative language of creation (e.g. institutional control) but failed to place equal emphasis on other portions of the legislative language concerning purpose (e.g. cohesive, cooperative undertaking, provide opportunities). The legislative debate that accompanied the University legislation is replete with words such as "autonomy", "waste", "duplication of courses", "coordination", "cohesiveness", and "cooperation". One measure provided the vehicle while the other provided the direction. The task of the Trustees is to blend the various parts of the System into a cohesive and efficient unit capable of meeting the needs of the general population of Maine whose tax dollars primarily support the System. Campus autonomy must be preserved but not at the expense of academic quality, public service, economic common sense or similar considerations that justify the existence of the present system.

This Report makes specific recommendations for improvement in many areas of administration, structure and academic performance. These recommendations need to be implemented, and this Committee has

---

* L.D. 1849, Second Special Session of the 103rd Legislature, Legislative Record, January 18, 22, 1968.
** 20 MRSA Sect. 2252 (6), 1968.
advised that students, faculty and administrators participate in this implementation. The very nature of the problems we are dealing with gives them an evolutionary character, changing types of students, of faculty, of research demands and of community needs. This is the changing environment in which a dynamic university exists. Change becomes part of the process.

Our emphasis in this Report is upon bold coordination; we insist that this is what the University needs at this time. We do not recommend the building upon a bureaucracy already in place or expanding layers of decision-making. Quite the contrary; we wish a coordinated effort among the campuses and their faculties to encourage easier access, transferability and program participation.

Thus, we must all continue to regard these matters with a sense of constructive pursuit; we Trustees have the principal responsibility to see that they do not go unheeded. ("The real success of academic life comes not from the imposition of tight standards from the center. The real glory is in the disparate energies that conform to no clearly articulated pattern." Letter to the Committee from a senior official of the American Council on Education.)

The Committee deliberately chose a wide spectrum of issues that deserved priority attention, yet acknowledged that certain long-term problems merited future study. Of equal importance, such significant issues as tuition, faculty compensation, funding models, enrollment, admissions and outreach relate directly to the areas for improvement highlighted in this Report. We indicate the need for an outside professional study to suggest a new salary plan and, clearly, tuition costs are so integral to academic concerns that the University system requires a five-year projection for improved planning processes. Although fiscal issues were not included in our report on academic affairs, there is a need for reviewing various funding models. For example, the disbursement of monies to each campus on a formula basis merits discussion on different available approaches.

The System Is Formed

In January of 1967, the Advisory Commission for the Higher Education Study, appointed in 1965 by Governor Kenneth M. Curtis at the behest of the 102nd Legislature, submitted its report. The Commission Chairman was James S. Coles, who reported that the Commission
approval of the report was unanimous. He said the Commission's recommendations would result in "splendid programs and facilities for diversified higher educational opportunity (for) the youth of Maine during the next several decades".

The Coles Commission made a strong plea for a "high priority in the allocation of funds" from the State to support the University. After invidious comparisons with other states, particularly Vermont and New Hampshire, the Commission said: "Clearly, Maine can, and Maine should, increase its effort."*

Legislative Mandate

The Lund bill, "An Act relating to Coordination of Public Higher Education", was passed by the Maine Senate on January 12, 1968, and in the House on January 22. In the report accompanying the legislation, written by the State Committee on Coordination of Higher Education, the Committee members said: "...the status quo is unacceptable if we are to envision a growing, improving, steadily strengthening system of public higher education in Maine". The Committee added that "it is our conviction that the recommendation is educationally sound, administratively efficient, politically realistic, and financially less expensive in the long run than comparable strengthening of the same institutions under the present system. We are under no illusion, however, that improvement of public higher education to the degree that is called for, in whatever way it is affected, can be inexpensive".**

There was opposition in both House and Senate, especially from members who were graduates of the University of Maine at Orono, who feared dilution of quality built up over the years by the association with less qualified institutions. But one prominent member of the Senate, in whose district Orono lay, declared that, however unpopular his vote might be and despite the fact that most of the Board of Trustees at the time opposed the merger, he felt that it was a necessary move and that "I would hope that this body this morning would take this big step forward and consolidate higher education of our State Colleges and the University".***

Later Scrutiny

The first Chancellor of the merged University of Maine appointed the Higher Education Planning Commission in 1969 "to bring advice and suggestions for a master plan for the University System". The HEP

---

** Legislative report of the Committee on Coordination of Higher Education. December 18, 1967.
*** Senate debate, Legislative Record, January 18, 1968.
Commission (also known as the Coffin Commission for its chairman, Hon. Frank M. Coffin) issued a progress report in November 1969 and an extensive final report in April 1972. The Commission said that the "critical distinction" between itself and the Coles Commission was: "The Coles Commission mapped the areas of effort to achieve a quality higher education system appropriate for Maine; the HEP Commission has approached the more detailed task of setting forth priorities in terms of objectives for the 1970's and a time frame for their accomplishment."

The HEP Report contained a long-range financial and enrollment plan which tended to overestimate actual experience. Nevertheless, a principal thrust of the Report was the need to solve the problems of financing higher education. Among the "Guiding Principles" laid down by the HEP Commission was: "Maine needs to invest more in education than the equivalent of its per capita rank in wealth because Maine must raise its standards of life and living." Commenting on its financial projections, it said: "While the annual sums reported are substantial, it should be remembered that generations of Maine citizens before us have contributed to a buildup of physical and human capital in the University whose total value today exceeds a quarter of a billion dollars. The annual operating budget is merely the servicing cost of this most important capital asset."*

Other studies followed the HEP Report: the Joint Action Commission of University Goals and Direction developed a plan to implement the 1970 merger of the Portland and Gorham branches of the University; the External Salary Committee considered University employees' salaries; the Report of the Task Force on Resource Allocation researched various possible systems. The Maine Management and Cost Survey analyzed the over-all financial aspects of the University system with a view toward saving money.

A more recent study, the Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Performance Audit of the 107th Legislature, considered the system as a whole and concluded that "the structure of the University of Maine should not be altered".**

The University Today

The University of Maine is beset with problems so familiar that it would seem that nothing has progressed since the merger of 1968. This is not a true impression. The evidence indicates that there have been accomplishments as well as failures. The 103rd Legislature mandated change, and this has occurred. However, Maine still ranks forty-eighth

---


among the fifty states in the proportion of its young people who go on to college. In spite of this fact, the University system can look back with pride to some of its achievements. Enrollment at all campuses in 1968 totalled approximately 19,000. In 1976 more than 26,500 students registered for classes. This represents an increase of nearly 40 percent. At the time of the merger only four of the seven institutions were accredited. The number of faculty members with doctorates has increased significantly throughout the system. Today all of the institutions are accredited. Thirty-four new two-year programs and thirty-five baccalaureate programs have been added. At the time of the merger five of the seven institutions were primarily single-purpose teacher training facilities. Today, each of the seven institutions has re-directed its resources and energies to meet the needs of a broader range of people.

This report is unique. It stresses our shortcomings and not our achievements. It recognizes the fact that many of the promises of the University System have not been fulfilled. It attempts to locate our failings and set in motion the necessary forces required to re-direct the academic and administrative efforts of the System and its parts.

This report is unique because it is the product of the Board of Trustees. It is the clear legal duty and responsibility of the Board of Trustees to set policy for the University and plan for its future.

In this Report, we stress such continuing problems as transferability, access, structure, coordination, recognition of strong resource areas, development of more opportunities to extend our mission. But underlying all these do-it-now concerns is our desire to place the University of Maine into proper perspective within the lives of Maine’s citizens.

Is the University of Maine providing adequate higher education to the State’s youth when only half of them enter? If the premise is that one of the values of undergraduate, graduate and professional training is to energize the economic and cultural life of a state, to encourage business and industry, to attract favorable attention from elsewhere, what success has Maine had with its higher education contribution? And what support have its citizens given to public higher education?

**Campus Coordination**

One prominent theme of our preliminary statement, Guideposts for the Future of the University of Maine, was the need for better coordination throughout the University System. Most responses at the forums we held and at other campus meetings were sympathetic to this theme.

The University as a System is a reality. The System is much more valuable than the sum of its parts. Our recommendations are meant to support integrity of both faculty and campus. A strong campus working
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cooperatively within the System is a greater benefit to itself and to the System. The areas in which we have made specific recommendations are supportive, not competitive to the status quo.

If a genuine effort is made to study earnestly and implement some of the recommendations contained in this Report, we believe substantial progress is possible soon. Too many studies have received discussion rather than genuine responses to their detailed recommendations. We were astounded at how many recommendations we were making which had already been made and either ignored or shelved.

Thus, this is a continuing effort which must be monitored. We have advised our fellow and successor Board members to follow up these recommendations in a positive way and to develop those others which seem appropriate in the future.

The words of the HEP Report on the structure of the University are still pertinent: "The eight campuses of the University are partners, each with unique strengths and interests. The total responsibility of the University can best be fulfilled as individual campuses divide the responsibility among themselves and act in partnership, not in isolation, to serve the Maine people."

It is in this spirit that our recommendations for improvements are made. We cannot accomplish our goals in isolation. We recognize our partnership with the entire University family and our objective — to serve the needs of as many Maine citizens as possible.
Objectives: Short Term And Long Term

Since the legislative mandate to form it in 1968, the University System has continued to strive towards its goal of quality public higher education for Maine citizens, while remaining flexible in responding to the changing needs for education as reflected in the economy, in enrollment and in the mix of the student body.

The growth in numbers of part-time and adult learners suggests significant changes in the missions of all of the campuses. While the full-time, day-time, campus-based and younger student is still central in the Trustees' concerns and plans, the new emphasis on part-time learners must lead to better integration of all types of students.

Persistent problems such as accessibility and transferability must be addressed with new vigor at all levels of the University's educational pattern — undergraduate, graduate and professional. Essential to this task, along with skillful administration and teaching, is adequate funding. This problem is one which Trustees cannot ignore as we study the future of the University of Maine, but ultimately it must be solved by Maine's citizens and their elected leaders.

The themes that remain constant in our present task include:

- how to bring better public higher education and related services to the citizens of Maine;
- how to improve system-wide coordination while preserving campus integrity;
- how the student — undergraduate or graduate, young or adult, full-time or part-time — can fully use the University resources.

The University carries out its general mission to the State by assigning specific activities to each of its seven campuses and their respective academic and administrative units. These responsibilities have been established on the basis of such criteria as: 1) insuring a solid core of general studies; 2) building centers of excellence and expertise in specialized fields; and 3) responding to the unique cultural, agricultural and industrial needs of regions. It is our view that the University has, since the 1968 merger, one mission, and that mission guides the System and the individual campuses.

In our Guideposts statement, we referred to restatement of campus missions, but our study has convinced us that each campus mission is the University mission. In the past, too often "campus missions" have been used only to frustrate the plans of the total University. Campus missions should be an implementation of such plans. Specific changes in the mission of a University campus may, from time to time, be required. Changes will be requested on a campus-by-campus basis as the need
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arises. It is not necessary or appropriate to make a mass restatement of missions at this time. Changed mission statements may result from the planning process as called for in this Report.

The University mission represents the background and foundation for future planning. The range of issues that has been raised by the Committee is too extensive to be covered in a single document and too complex to be resolved by any single planning effort. Some issues raised by the Committee and reinforced by public comment in the forums require extensive study and the acquisition of more refined data before alternative solutions can be considered. Some issues are near resolve and therefore their inclusion in the Report seems unnecessary. We view this as the first report of a continuing evaluation of the University of Maine. We have selected four issues that can improve the University and we have set these into a framework for University progress: Improving Student Access, Improving the Delivery of Services, Improving the Use of Human Resources, and Improving Collaboration.
Section I—Improving Student Access

Full and proper use of a public university system depends on ease of access for undergraduates and all other candidates for credit, with the qualification that ease of entry must not imply lessening of standards. Students must be allowed the opportunity to prove their competence. Financial, programmatic and geographic barriers to university access, however, still are substantial for Maine citizens, and efforts to reduce barriers must be increased.

Since the merger of the University campuses in 1968, the ease of access to academic programs and the ease of transfer from one program to another or one campus to another have improved. Much remains to be done. The development of community college services with two- and three-year associate degrees, has presented new opportunities to a greater diversity of students. Coordination between the University and the Vocational-Technical Institutes also has promoted greater use of University facilities. Growing use of the University by older students who, because of their every-day obligations, must be part-time students, is a particularly significant new development. All of these challenges add to the continuing considerations which must be given to the structure of the University System.

These matters and how they can be improved are discussed in the following section of this Report.
Access

The Trustees are committed to the reduction of barriers to access to the University System. The three major barriers are: financial — the cost of tuition, room and board and the loss of earnings from foregone employment; geographic — the effort and enterprise needed to reach appropriate programs and travel to and from distant campuses; and programmatic — the difficulty in learning the details of what programs and courses are offered on the various campuses and the availability of specific programs. These barriers apply to all students—undergraduates as well as part-time students who are increasingly seeking access to University facilities.* ("As a parent, (I) found great problems with the course numbering system and transfer policy. It appears as if it is intentionally made more difficult." A utility executive at a discussion meeting on the Committee's Guideposts.)

This Committee is interested in specific proposals which have been made to aid access. The devices suggested include the development of a University catalog to describe services of the entire University to the public and to potential students; a common-course numbering system for all campuses to describe and relate the course offerings which have commonality; and better procedures and policies for advising students how best to use the services of the total University. These and related proposals have been both strongly supported and firmly condemned in various parts of the University System. Some say that they are essential; others that they are impossible to do effectively. We believe they merit intense examination leading to decision in the immediate future.

Access for a wider range of the citizens of Maine will require the design and redesign of programs to balance both the academic and employment needs of those citizens. The public should be made aware that the value of a university to the individual cannot be conclusively measured. There is pressure to equate successful completion of university studies with instant job placement. The University can indeed help develop marketable skills while at the same time it educates the whole person and emphasizes the acquisition of knowledge as a life-long process. The University must evince concern for balance between liberal arts and programs that are vocational and professional in their emphasis. Student expectation and parent understanding should be that jobs and education are not mutually exclusive.

The success of community colleges in Bangor and Augusta suggests potential for such institutions in cities throughout the State. It is too early to assess the performance of the new outreach community programs in the Lewiston-Auburn, Mid-Coast and York County areas. We believe, however, that community colleges, which are located at easily accessible sites and which include in their offerings relatively short (two-year
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associate) programs, can facilitate over-all access to the University System. The community college may be critically important in providing access for the part-time learner. In the long-term future, further expansion of community colleges may be considered following rigorous evaluation of the present programs.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Chancellor appoint a committee of administrators, faculty and students to seek those programs where greater access is possible and to examine common-course numbering and System-wide catalog concepts with an action plan in mind. A progress report to the Chancellor should be submitted by June 30, 1977, and a final report to the Trustees by November 30, 1977.

The Committee further recommends that the current status and success of the University’s community college programs be reviewed by a faculty-student committee, seeking quantitative data on attendance, course completion, cost-effectiveness, geographic balance, and transferability within the total University System, and report to the Trustees by October 31, 1977.

Finally, the Committee recommends that Trustees continue to increase their efforts in assisting in the reduction of barriers to access, such as economic difficulties with tuition, room and board costs, excessive distance from campuses, and difficulties in the transfer from two-year to four-year programs.

Transferability

The transfer of academic credits from one campus to another is an issue that continues to consume a great deal of time and energy among students, parents and faculty. Student mobility is inevitable and desirable in a state as large and diverse as Maine. Transfer problems are highly complex and individual in a system-wide learning process. On the one hand, ease of transfer and access is desired by the mobile student, full-time as well as part-time. On the other hand, the incompatibility of course structure or facilities between educational units becomes an impediment.

Much progress has been made in the area of transferability in the past few years, but it has been slow. Improved opportunity must be sought for transfer from one campus to another and between programs. We recognize that the approach to teaching similar material may differ between campuses and programs. Some programs stress practical experience from the beginning, while others start with a more academic approach. Since the goals sought by a promising student may rise as he/she progresses, the system must be able to accommodate "upward mobility". For example, more VTI transfers may be useful. ("...all of the
campuses of the University have New England accreditation. Why, then, if we accept credits from outside the System from accredited colleges or universities, why not from within?" Campus Community report from the University of Maine at Presque Isle, February 7, 1977.)

The content of many courses at the freshman and sophomore level, such as introductory English, science, math and language, fits well with the concepts of ease of transfer. Other courses are not designed for ready transfer and should not be considered in that light. Transfer "from", as well as transfer "to", become factors in this situation.

The committee, of course, is well aware of different admission policies on the various campuses. Recognition of these need not hinder more flexible and rapid transfer opportunities for the average student. The spirit of transferability should be paramount throughout the University.

As a long-term goal, the Committee looks forward to creation of a University-wide Degree which will permit the highly qualified student to experience the best of each or many of the campuses.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that a Subcommittee of the Trustees be designated to establish objectives and guidelines for a University-wide policy of transferability of credits.

The Committee further recommends a faculty Task Force assisted by students should be appointed to gather information regarding transfer of faculty and students throughout the System and to identify the transfer problems, discipline by discipline. A Task Force report should be made to the Trustee Subcommittee by September 30, 1977, including a plan for implementation involving as many programs as possible.

**Continuing Education**

Continuing Education represents a new wave of higher education, opening the door to new learners of all ages, experiences and previous education. It often is an important “second-chance” opportunity. The greatest enrollment growth in the last five years has been among the older, part-time students, taking either degree or non-degree courses, usually in the evening. These students — who now constitute 34 percent of the University enrollment — are working people, homeowners and senior citizens. Indeed, growth in this area is such that this Committee feels the designation of a Continuing Education Division (CED) appears to be an artificial distinction for the student.
This University is a comprehensive institution. Its academic programs for part-time students must no longer be regarded as falling into categories separate from undergraduate and graduate programs. Rather, each campus should support academic programs for all students, old, young, part-time, full-time, in a single learning day that applies to all.

Continuing Education, as it is now regarded within the University, has become an anachronism, because it has tended to make second-class students out of part-time learners whose quest for credits toward degrees is as legitimate as that of full-time learners. The University has undergone a great deal of unconscious growth in its continuing education division and this has tended to push part-time students into less convenient scheduling and away from the more attractive courses with the best full-time and part-time faculty. It is clear that part-time students merit more attention and that all students would benefit by melding continuing education into the general education pattern.

This concept will enrich the learning experience of both categories of students. As a long-term goal, it also will result in most courses being taught by regular faculty, full-time and part-time, who must be considered the prime sources of learning for the students.

On some of the University campuses CED programs are part of full teaching loads. Others arrange make-shift teaching assignments which serve neither the faculty nor the student well. We have determined that a goal of complete integration of full-time educational programs with continuing education programs is the desirable situation.*

There are, of course, many non-credit offerings in the present Continuing Education Division. Most of these have genuine intellectual and cultural content and should be offered. As they are outside the degree pattern, they will continue to be offered under the aegis of the University's public service mission, and they should be completely self-supporting.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt a University policy which states that all courses in each University program taken for academic credit be integrated; that in a comprehensive institution there is no special distinction for part-time students, those new learners of all ages, experiences and previous education. The implementation of the suggested changes should be carried out over a three-year period, in order to minimize the possible budgetary effects. We recognize the impact this move may have on

* The HEP Commission Report stressed continuing education as an "updating (that) will always be necessary if Maine business, industry, and services are to compete with the rest of the nation."

faculty compensation and the time needed to make the recommendation work out satisfactorily for faculty, students and the University.

The Committee further recommends that a Trustee Subcommittee be appointed to develop an implementation study for accomplishing this goal with the assistance of faculty and administrators. A progress report on this project is requested by September 30, 1977.

Structure

The formation of the seven-campus University of Maine, bringing the land-grant campus, the state normal colleges and the community colleges into a unified system occurred during the past decade. During that time, each campus gained in strength. Each developed a well balanced higher education program for full-time and part-time students.

This was done through the joining of seven campuses under one management and administrative system. While maintaining substantial autonomy on each campus, the System provides more opportunities for interaction and collaboration among the campuses. The System prompts stronger and better coordinated central administrative functions while supporting the academic, research and public service missions of the University and of each campus.

Progress has been made in such areas as transferability of credits, graduate study and interchange of resources, so that more Maine students benefit from the total University. This committee reiterates its recommendation that each campus continue to provide baccalaureate degrees.

The recent report of the Legislative Performance Audit Committee said: "The structure of the University of Maine should not be altered...the Committee believes that because the University System is functioning quite well, the present structure should be maintained." *

This Committee believes that the Legislators' expectations are not ill-founded. It is clear that, in the development of each of the campuses, enhancement of quality has been a result of the System joining. Each campus has become stronger, physically and academically, and more helpful to its local region. (The thought of restructuring the University shows "a general lack of appreciation of the vastness of the State and the resultant wide distribution of its population and of the widely differing economic, cultural and motivational patterns of the people of Maine." From comments from the Machias campus in response to the Guideposts Statement.)

Nevertheless, this Committee feels the structure of the campuses has not yet settled in for all time and should be under continuing examination, both as to effecting administrative mergers and to undoing them. ("...the difference in costs to the student of commuting or attending a residential college would effectively prohibit access to certain programs to a large number of students. The same consideration is undoubtedly the strongest justification for continuing the four-year institutions in so many locations." District Court Judge, Portland.)

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends a thorough inquiry with regard to combining administration of campuses. As a first priority, the progress of the Portland-Gorham merger should be assessed.

The Committee further recommends that a Trustee Subcommittee on Structure should be assisted by an independent consultant charged with reviewing the structure of the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham. The Trustees should receive a report from the Subcommittee by June 1977. The Committee anticipates that the examination of structure will produce insight as to the advantages and disadvantages regarding merger for other possible configurations within the University System.
Section II—Improving The Delivery Of Services

As a fully comprehensive public higher education institution, the University of Maine offers many academic programs and services to its students and other citizens in the State. All can be measured in such terms as student hours, number of course offerings, number of faculty involved, number of graduates in the field, number of professionals in service in Maine and other evidences of success in serving the State.

In these terms, two broad areas — Teacher Education and Health Science Education — account for approximately 50 percent of the University offerings, student enrollment and faculty time. These two areas are the resources for Maine's teachers, nurses, principals, hospital supervisors, superintendents, dental technicians, counsellors, paramedics, dieticians, recreation staff and related personnel.

In addition, Maine is served by its Graduate Education programs at Orono and Portland-Gorham.

Education at all levels is promoted through the services of the Maine Public Broadcasting Network, through which the University speaks to learners of all ages and locations.

Finally, as a repository of knowledge, the University's Library System serves not only those on campus but the general public.

All of these services, with their opportunities for greater impact and their current problems, are discussed in this Section.
Health Science Education

The University has a significant commitment to health science education with a wide variety of teaching programs on all of the campuses: the School of Nursing at Portland/Gorham, the nursing associate program at Augusta, the dental hygiene program at Bangor Community College, the geriatric aide program at Presque Isle, the health and family life program at Fort Kent, the Health Education Resource Center programs at Farmington, the recreation management program at Machias and the human development and medical technology programs at Orono are just some examples of health science education.

Pre-medical programs are also available within health science education curricula. The University should lend its resources and expertise to assist the health agencies when and where it is appropriate to its mission. The prospect of a state medical school in Maine has been turned down twice in the past two years by the Legislature and the Governor. Barring any mandate from the Legislature, the Trustees accept the fact that we should not expend University energies and resources on the initiation of a medical school. Meanwhile, the University will continue to prepare students for acceptance at medical schools and dental and veterinarian schools throughout the country.

In April of 1976, the ad hoc Committee requested a review of the University's commitment to health science education and recommendations for action. A Report was submitted on June 30, 1976.

An important outcome of the Report was the establishment of priorities within the spectrum of health science education activities, including special attention to nursing, health education resources, allied health education and nutrition.

A Coordinator of Health Science Education was appointed and an Advisory Committee was organized, which held its first meeting on September 15, 1976. The first phase of a total health education plan has been completed. The membership of the Advisory Committee includes: Dean of the School of Nursing, Portland; Director of the Health Education Resource Center, Farmington; Chairperson, Health and Human Services, Bangor Community College; Chairperson, Nursing and Health Sciences, Augusta; Chairperson, Sciences and Math, Presque Isle; faculty appointees from Fort Kent, Machias and Portland-Gorham campuses; Director, Medical Technology, Orono; and two practicing physicians from Togus and Augusta.

Many problems and opportunities are faced by this new concept in University-wide coordination in the health sciences education field. The model may serve as a policy base for similar arrangements in other broad subject fields.
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**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the role of the Health Science Education Coordinator be continued. The earlier request for a "plan encompassing the best use of resources for continuing certain health education activities, for giving additional support to others and for initiating new health education activities" shall have its initial report completed by April 1977.

The Committee further recommends that integrated planning for nursing education, nutrition and allied health, and the integration of the Health Education Resource Center in the System-wide health plan should begin immediately. The first phase of the plan for University health coordination should be prepared by June 1977.

**Teacher Education**

All campuses of the University, except Augusta, at present maintain teacher preparation courses. There is a long history of teacher training on most of the campuses; indeed, four were State-supported normal schools before joining the University System in 1968.

In the past three years a pattern of fewer teachers being prepared (down from 7,500 to 4,500 in the University of Maine) and greater demands for well qualified teachers has become apparent. Graduate education for future teachers is increasing. The modern teacher is called upon to engage in a new, more diverse role in society where a generalist's training in a wide range of arts and sciences is essential background. Teacher training must have a strong human-services orientation. The changing role of the teacher, already required to be highly competent in subject matter, must also absorb more demanding professional standards.

While the role of the teacher is changing, teacher education has not changed in pace with demand. The evidence suggests few examples of innovation in an otherwise unchanged "collection" of teacher education programs. Rather than being addressed to the clear needs of today's elementary and secondary students, teacher education in the University seems to be responding to certification requirements that translate into courses.

("Of more pressing and immediate concern to those responsible for teacher education is the quality of programs throughout the State. Recent budget cuts, coupled with a declining market for teachers, have forced institutions to diversify and place their resources and emphasis in other programs. The result of budget reduction in teacher education with little or no program reduction on any campus raises serious questions with respect to the quality of programs, quality of students in the programs, and quality of graduates." From statement submitted to the ad hoc Committee by the Academic Deans at the Orono campus.)
Because of the concern State-wide for the development of excellent teachers, the needs for better planning and balance in teacher education and the need for more thorough program review, it would be beneficial to the entire University System to have one campus identified as the coordinating center of expertise, of special technical facilities and of resident and visiting specialists in education.

Each campus now doing so would continue to train teachers. The centralization of planning program content for teacher-preparation at one location, a College of Education, could bring more logic and order to a discipline which, while diminishing in number of candidates, is vastly increasing in quality demands.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends immediate inquiry into the suitability of designating one campus as the University's College of Education. As such, it would be looked upon as the repository of degree-requirement standards, course dimensions and other guidelines for a total teacher education curriculum in the State.

The College would be the organizational center for placement activities throughout the State and, in supplementing the campus-based daily working relationships with teacher groups, school district superintendents and the State Department of Education and Cultural Services. The College would be the key contact point for System-wide issues that affect education. It also would be responsible for developing State-wide plans as well as establishing quality controls for graduate study. The specific graduate programs would continue to be offered by Orono and Portland-Gorham and these graduate centers would be responsible for the delivery of programs throughout the State. An initial feasibility report from a committee of administrators, faculty and the public [i.e., school committee members], appointed by the Chancellor, should be submitted to the Trustees by July 31, 1977.

**Public Service**

Public service is a significant component of public higher education responsibility. The range of activities has brought the University into closer contact with Maine residents through the use of campus facilities, research capabilities and faculty talent in direct support of community and individual needs throughout the State.

Public service activities on the campuses include the use of University faculty in elementary and secondary schools to interchange ideas directly with students, demonstrate specific techniques and develop-
ments in science and the arts and to help teachers become more productive; direct aid by faculty experts to develop new businesses locally; apply new research technologies at agriculture stations and elsewhere; develop energy studies, animal culture and marine programs for farmers and fishermen.

One element of the University's public service held in high regard among Maine citizens is the Cooperative Extension Service (CES). A product of federal, state and county governments, CES relates directly to the farmer, homemaker and youth (through 4-H Clubs). Yet its relationship to the University is little understood. (A former Orono Trustee said: "The CES is a key unit in the system. It offers a local control program to upgrade the quality of life in a manner and at a speed governed by local citizens.") Many citizens do not even recognize its strong ties to the various University campuses, or that the University supplies 33 percent of the annual budget of CES in addition to professional and research support. The changing patterns of society, the economy and agriculture may require dynamic changes in the Cooperative Extension Service.

The public service mission on each campus needs clearer definition and rationale. The impression that many public service efforts are more public relations than actual service must be countered by activities which are oriented to carefully assessed and high priority public needs.

The concept of rigorous review to justify the continuation of public service activities merits detailed exploration. Clearly, certain activities outlive their utility and should be terminated; and other activities would benefit from intensive renewal. In terms of planning, each new activity should be subject to a termination date as well as evaluation to determine whether the activity is to be continued.

The Trustees wish to have a clearer picture of the University's public service role, where it is active, how successful it is and what specific projects are being conducted. A list of available services needs State-wide dissemination. There also is a need for more data with regard to costs and criteria used for funding of services, and conditions governing their initiation.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends the immediate appointment of a Citizen/University Task Force to examine the public service role on each campus and to submit a report to the Trustees within three months. Qualitative and quantitative reviews of what public services are now being rendered by the University in the State and the various communities, their cost-effectiveness and potential benefit and what recommendations are appropriate for future public service by the campuses will be the central charge. The Cooperative Extension Task Force report due in May 1977 should be included.
Library Services

The quality of a modern university is significantly influenced by the quality of its library system. The library system must be excellent if programs of instruction and research are to be excellent. The University of Maine library services suffer from an inability to keep up with the greatly increased reference and utilization demands and the sharp rise in book and periodical costs, as well as increased needs for audio-visual equipment and other modern techniques. The campus libraries at present have fewer professional staff, fewer support personnel, less student assistance, fewer purchases and shorter hours of operation than in 1970.

There are, of course, different levels of quality among the libraries on the various campuses. All are not equal as to the size and content of their collection, the size of their professional staff or the physical site for library service. But all face the same hard problems outlined here.

Failure to maintain and strengthen library services threatens accreditation, challenges quality and limits student options. This deficiency is felt on every campus.

Thus is one of the principal supports of a higher education system endangered.

Every effort must be made to strengthen the University's library service. Current coordination activities among campus librarians for greater resource interchange and mutual assistance are commended. They should be formally encouraged and facilitated as much as possible. Long-range interests should include identification of areas of mutual concern to other libraries in the State, both public and private.

The concept of the "lead campus", not always consciously employed, has been in effect for some years in making the System work better. The "lead campus" is a particular and unique State-wide responsibility assigned to one campus for the System, such as nursing, doctoral studies and undergraduate special education programs.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that a Trustee Subcommittee on Library Quality be formed to monitor the status of the University's library system. It is essential that a five-year plan be developed that indicates System-wide concerns, accreditation problems, specific priorities and accompanying budget recommendations.

The Committee further recommends that the "lead campus" concept applies to library quality and the Head Librarian of the Fogler Library at the University of Maine at Orono should be appointed immediately to work with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on problems of
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System-wide dimensions and to seek solutions beneficial to all campuses. A representative faculty/student panel should be appointed by June 1, 1977, to work with the librarians on these problems. An initial report should be made by September 30, 1977.

Graduate Education

A strong graduate program in the University System is a requisite to over-all quality of the University. Scholarship and research strengthen teaching and result in better service to the public. Research activities by faculty and graduate students benefit both the University and the State.

Graduate education entails higher costs, placing special demands on faculty due to closer personal relationships and the need for additional resources in such areas as library acquisition, student assistants and research funds. Graduate education requires professional competence and specified faculty time so that graduate endeavors will not represent an overload on the best qualified professors.

Graduate education at the University has much to commend it. The Committee feels at this time that it is advisable to maintain two graduate centers. Graduate courses should be delivered throughout the State by a greater sharing of graduate faculty and greater use of newer technologies such as television. There is a need to explore the present interchange between course credits received at the other campuses toward graduate degrees and also the arrangements of faculty travelling to other campuses to teach graduate courses.

Graduate education in Maine carries with it many professional opportunities. For example, while professional education for legal careers is well served by the University’s School of Law, there are complaints that the School has too many out-of-state students. In addition, some argue that applicants are attracted in part by the favorable tuition level and that the rate of acceptances results in an excessive number of lawyers. Neither the continuation of this situation, if true, nor the complete elimination of the School of Law would serve Maine well. There also are arguments that the School of Law should strive to serve to increase the competence of those already practicing law in Maine, that there should be added emphasis on improvement of the practicing bar through continuing education courses designed for this purpose.
Recommendation: The Committee recommends that graduate degree programs be concentrated at Orono and Portland/Gorham. At the same time, there is a need to consider a plan for offering graduate studies throughout the State. The Chancellor should appoint a Graduate Education Committee, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Maine at Orono, to review the issues and to develop a broad design for access to graduate programs by all students, and report to the Trustees by January 1978.

The Committee further recommends that all graduate programs should be examined in terms of cost and service to the State. Independent needs assessments should be undertaken to provide five-year projections of specific graduate school enrollments.

Finally, the Committee recommends that, although there are a number of professional programs, because of its significance, the School of Law receive consideration. School of Law tuitions should be raised to 100 percent of cost for all students. At the same time, a study is needed for proposals for adequate provision of student financial support for in-state residents of limited means. The percentage of out-of-state students at the Law School should approximate 20 percent of each entering class. In addition, the range of public service activities should be reviewed with the goal of providing programs designed to improve professional competence, as part of a commitment to continuing legal education.

Maine Public Broadcasting Network

The Maine Public Broadcasting Network, an integral part of the University of Maine System, presents radio and television programs which are generally of a cultural and educational nature. Both public radio and TV networks have a potential far beyond that which has yet been achieved in serving the educational needs of the State. The opportunity is not to replace existing programs of excellence at the elementary and high school levels but to develop new and additional ones for expanded audiences.

This Committee encourages the concept of MPBN as a State-wide service on an equal policy basis with the campuses of the University. Many of the outreach problems now being addressed by the University and realignment of the remote areas from which the University attracts students suggest that the radio and TV classroom has a potential as yet untapped in this State. Licensed by the FCC to the Board of Trustees, the radio network brings about 6,500 hours a year to Maine citizens and the TV network about 4,300 hours, through stations in Portland, Presque Isle, Augusta, Bangor, Orono, Calais and Biddeford. Many educational
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programs for the elementary and high school levels emanate from public radio and television stations in Maine. Classroom-oriented shows from children's TV through adult learning programs are available.

There are serious cost issues when educational programs are added to the present radio and television operation. But the supplemental programming would involve more people, old and young in the near and remote locations and on all economic levels, many who might never be exposed to higher education.

It should be emphasized that the MPBN General Manager is responsible through the Chancellor for the operation and coordination of all of the University's broadcasting operations, licensed by the FCC to the all of the University's broadcasting operations. This responsibility includes microwave, satellite, cable and other communications activities on various campuses, whether under the authority of FCC or intra-state.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the Maine Public Broadcasting Network be placed on an equal policy basis with the seven campuses of the University. We believe that the General Manager should be accorded the same status as a campus President and should be invited to meet regularly with the Administrative Council.

The Committee further recommends that, in conjunction with the campus Presidents, he should direct the preparation of a Plan of Action for the use of radio, television and microwave facilities to extend the academic activities of the University to a potentially large State-wide audience in concert with the initial legislation creating the Network; to rationalize the awarding of course credits through this programming; to assess the likely costs of the additional services; and to investigate the possibilities of new supporting resources from the federal and foundation sources. This plan should be reported to the Educational Policy Committee in October 1977.
Section III—Improving The Use Of Human Resources

A university depends, in the final analysis, on a faculty of high quality, strongly motivated to carry out its teaching and research duties. The key to growth and successful development of academic programs is the encouragement of the human resources within the University. Thus, in this Section, we make recommendations not only regarding Faculty Development, but also the creation of two University-wide strategies. One is designed to improve teaching on all of the campuses. The other is to coordinate programs which will benefit both students and faculty. They are the University Professorship and the University Coordinator.
University Professorships

Many faculty members at the University of Maine are oriented toward a single campus and too often have little or no contact with other campuses or their professional colleagues in the same subject areas in other institutions. While this set of circumstances promotes a salutary loyalty and cohesiveness on each campus, it denies both students and faculty the full benefit of new ideas and new perceptions from the larger academic community.

Such benefits could be added by creating University Professorships, to which would be appointed, for fixed or variable periods of time, outstanding scholars and teachers, including retirees, already on one of the campuses of this or other universities. These special appointments would entail teaching and/or scholarly responsibilities on more than one campus, thus sharing the expertise more equitably throughout the system.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Educational Policy Committee receive a report by June 1, 1977, on a developmental plan for University Professorships which would include conditions for application, criteria for selection, various compensation models, and range of terms.

University Coordinators

Better coordination of programs within the University System has obvious advantages: it reduces uneconomic duplication; it builds on the strengths now present on each campus; it provides more flexibility among courses, students and faculty; it uses limited resources in manpower and equipment to the maximum. Coordination in a multi-campus institution is a prime example of the value of cost-effectiveness in a situation of finite resources.

In every study which prepared the way for Maine's University System, coordination was foremost among the stated goals. Yet considerable anxiety was expressed during our public forums that "coordination" would undermine or usurp campus autonomy or faculty integrity. Committee members at our hearings and in this Report hastened to reassure the University community that the desire for better coordination was intended to strengthen each campus and its academic programs.

In our preliminary statement, Guideposts for the Future of the University of Maine, we asked for "coordination of campus effort,
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coordination in planning, maximum utilization of limited resources”. Our concept of a University coordinator is a faculty member or administrator who is a recognized leader in a subject field and who would observe and gather information on plans and efforts in that field from every point within the University complex and outside if necessary. He or she would seek opportunities to share the strong points of one campus with the other campuses, to recognize excellence and draw attention to it so that it may spread. A University Coordinator may perform that role for a brief period or over many years. He or she would be a source of information, an advocate for resources, an initiator of new ideas, a leader in establishing System priorities — an opportunity rather than a threat. The assignment is a specialized one, generally in addition to regular assignments, but it may require conditions of released time. The minor additional funds that may be required by University Coordinators would be supplied by the Chancellor’s Office which also serves as the line for reporting responsibility.

There is no single model for Coordinators. One model of a University Coordinator is found in the experience of the Coordinator for Health Science Education. No “added layer” of bureaucracy is suggested; the main interest is in encouraging initiative to provide the bold coordination noted earlier in this Report.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the concept of University Coordinators be implemented. Efforts should be made to employ the concept where and as the Chancellor deems appropriate. The Chancellor should report to the Board on the evolution of the concept at its June 1977 meeting.

Faculty Development

The status of University faculty at the present time, in terms of compensation and working conditions, leaves much to be desired. We have postponed planned and projected academic programs, reduced our competitive position in the national marketplace for young faculty, increased class size and course load, limited time and support available for research and scholarship, reduced attendance at professional meetings, restricted interactions with colleagues and lost senior faculty to other institutions without being in a position to replace them with persons of like calibre and competence. All of these factors have resulted in a decline in faculty morale and academic quality. Substantive
improvement in these areas is imperative. ("You appear to have given some attention to rewards. The 'University Coordinator' and the 'statewide professorships' tilt in this direction. Can you develop other instruments of recognition that will be viewed as valued incentives to the change process?" President, College Entrance Examination Board.)

The Trustees must support the strengthening of the University faculty by:

- reviewing salary schedules with the aid of professional consultants, to develop a definitive salary program with recruitment and retention needs in mind;
- seeking more funds from whatever sources are available — the State, outside grants, the federal government or economies elsewhere — to be used to bolster faculty salary schedules to close the gap where it exists;
- supporting a sabbatical leave program, however tentative, upon which to build in the future;
- developing in-service procedures and programs for the review of tenured faculty; for participation in post-doctoral programs, and for the introduction of new concepts in retraining;
- finding ways to permit faculty members to meet their colleagues on other campuses in the University and at professional meetings elsewhere;
- improving the general environment of learning and teaching and studying at the University in order to retain senior faculty and attract junior faculty.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that a Trustees Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning be appointed to analyze, with the administration and faculty, the problems and potential of faculty development. An initial status report is requested from the Chancellor by October 1977.

---

*The HEP Report, p. 87, specifically projected funds for this purpose beginning in 1972, but no action has ever been taken.
Section IV—Improving Collaboration

Among the great strengths of a university can be how it relates to other institutions of higher education. In addition, its interaction with the State’s business, commerce, science and industrial communities and with the individual needs of its citizens in such areas as health, environment and occupation is important.

The University would be wasting its resources and those to be found elsewhere in the State if it did not seek better ways to measure and allocate its applied and basic science activities to assist business, industry, agriculture, marine sciences, hospitals and schools. In addition, University resources should be assessed with respect to how they may work with private colleges and the Vocational Technical Institutes in the State.

This Section describes the need for better University collaboration with the Vocational Technical Institutes and private colleges in Maine, and in the broad and expanding field of applied and basic research.
Vocational Technical Institutes (VTI)

The principal emphasis regarding the relationship between the University System and the Vocational Technical Institutes should be that of encouraging mutual assistance and eliminating unnecessary duplication. The possibility that VTIs might become part of the University System was considered throughout the Legislative debate in 1967 and 1968 which culminated in the formation of the present University System. It was decided not to include the VTIs. The Maine Management and Cost Survey recommendation to include VTIs has been reviewed by the Trustees, who concluded that it would serve neither the VTIs, who are quite successful on their own, nor the University.

(Joining of the two institutions is not "deemed a desirable option based on the history and success of the VTI and the over-all philosophical differences between the two systems." As stated at the Presque Isle forum by the Director of the Northern Maine Vocational Technical Institute.)

There is a need, however, to continue a healthy interchange between the University and the VTIs because of Maine's commitment to deliver the best education to all citizens of Maine. Easier transferability from the VTIs to the University, for example, is needed.

The overlap between University student needs and vocational needs remains obvious enough to merit continuing attention. There is a need to strengthen the One- and Two-Year Screening Committee made up of VTI and University staff members, employing more rigorous criteria for proposal reviews.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that transfer of appropriately qualified VTI students to the University must be actively encouraged.

The Committee further recommends that the potential areas of programmatic conflict between the two institutions, e.g., health, business education, computer technology, have been identified as areas of overlap and through cooperative effort the overlap should be resolved without damaging program integrity in either institution. The Trustees Education Policy Committee will receive a status report from the Joint VTI-University Screening Committee by June 30, 1977, regarding the current progress in transferability and the potential conflicts of interest regarding programs.
The limited resources, both human and fiscal, and the geographic isolation of all higher education institutions in Maine make particularly appropriate the exploration of opportunities for collaboration between the University and the private sector.

There is a range of private colleges in Maine, of varying size, quality and program focus. Each experiences academic problems similar in some degree to those discussed in this Report. At a very basic level, there is logic for sharing more information. One immediate result should be increased collegial interaction with faculty from various campuses sharing common subject area, background and experience.

There is a broad sector of private enterprise represented by business, commerce and industrial concerns who have particular research needs, data acquisition problems, library questions and similar concerns common to those issues faced by the University. It is important to the State that the University explore new relationships with these important activities in the same imaginative way we feel we should work more cooperatively with private higher education.

Similarly, broad cultural activities available to the public, supported in the main by private funds and directed by private citizens, offer further potential for collaboration with the State's public higher education System. Art, music, theater, dance, film, history and like areas of citizen concern provide a natural link with comparable interests in the University of Maine. ("...the role of the university as a center of cultural activity and as a place where the people of the state can learn the better qualities of life (should) receive due consideration." Resident of Winthrop.)

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that a Trustees Subcommittee on Private-Public Relationships be appointed to review the range of opportunities for interaction with the private sector, and that a Report be prepared by January 1978 outlining priority concerns and suggested patterns and formats for interaction.
Research And Development

Research is the effort to increase human knowledge through experimentation, examination and critical review of existing information and the development and testing of new hypotheses. Research processes may be applied to solutions both of basic theoretical questions and development techniques to more immediate practical problems. Research should be encouraged on the campuses of the University, as appropriate to that campus's portion of the University mission, to expand faculty teaching and scholarly competence, to increase knowledge of Maine resources, to improve their utilization and to assist Maine's economy.

Much research and development at the University of Maine campuses has proved extremely productive and useful. The achievements of such entities as the Center for Research and Advanced Study, the Social Science Research Institute, the Ira C. Darling Center for Research, Teaching and Service, are worth noting. There has been an impressive increase in the amount of time and money awarded for basic research and practical development in recent years. This is a sign of faculty skills and competence that have been rewarded by the selection of persons to receive grants and contracts that promote scholarly inquiry with pragmatic results.

The research activities undertaken throughout the University System have frequently been responsive to community needs. Research and development results have often been of value to government, commerce and business. There is need for coordination of selective research efforts on a University-wide basis. ("Competition between campuses is fine to a point, but I think it tends in some areas to be divisive rather than constructive...much can be done to bring the University system together so that it operates as a total unit rather than individual fiefdoms." From a letter from a Portland businessman.)

Recommendation: The Committee recommends the designation of an Advisory Committee on Research and Development, with representation from each campus and the existing research centers. Among the Advisory Committee's early assignments would be the formulation of University-wide goals governing research. In addition to the collective exchange of information among researchers, guidelines should be proposed on grant and contract search and the determination of how effectively funds are being used. A first report on progress in coordinating research activities within the University should be made to the Educational Policy Committee at the December 1977 meeting of the Board.
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