

12-20-1977

Board of Trustees December 20, 1977

University Of Maine System

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/bot-corp-records>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Repository Citation

University Of Maine System. (date).Board of Trustees [Meeting minutes]. Raymond H. Fogler Library Special Collections Department, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Corporate Records by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

December 20, 1977
Portland, Maine

DATE: 1/25/78

CLERK: jm

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

PRESENT: Chairman James Page, Francis Brown, Bernard Carpenter, Patricia DiMatteo, John Donovan, Stanley Evans, Susan Kominsky, Robert Masterton, Thomas Monaghan. Absent: Sawin Millett, Ellen Platz, Elizabeth Russell, Artemus Weatherbee and Nils Wessell. (One vacancy.) Staff: Chancellor McCarthy, Robert Binswanger, Mary Ann Haas. Press and public.

Chairman Page convened the meeting which had been called to consider the recommendations in the report of the Subcommittee on Structure which was formally submitted to the Board at the November meeting. The members of the Subcommittee are Dr. Donovan, Mr. Monaghan and Mr. Masterton, Chairman. Mr. Masterton was invited to present a detailed summary of the Subcommittee report.

Background. Mr. Masterton briefly outlined the purpose of the Subcommittee which was established to undertake a thorough inquiry into the success of combining administration of campuses as recommended by the ad hoc Committee on Academic Planning in March, 1977, with the first priority of the inquiry to be the assessment of the progress of the Portland-Gorham merger. Mr. Masterton noted that a team of consultants were retained to assist with the evaluation and that their report had been made widely available to the Portland-Gorham University community, with a request for written reactions. Before compiling its report to the Board, the Subcommittee discussed the written comments in detail and also met with various groups on the two campuses.

To summarize the Subcommittee's report, Mr. Masterton reviewed the individual recommendations contained therein:

1. Progress of the Merger. The Subcommittee members believe that the merger of the Portland and Gorham campuses into a single institution has been successful and their report includes a partial listing of some of the many areas in which progress has been made, as well as a partial listing of other areas which merit attention. The Subcommittee believes it is time to set aside any lingering doubts about the permanency of the merger and it recommends a) that the Board reaffirm the merger and pledge its support to the continued improvement of the institution; b) that since the hyphenated name of the institution tends to emphasize the historical division of the campuses, the name be changed to reflect the progress which has been made and to illustrate the institution's mission to serve the region.

2. Mission Statement. The consultant team suggested that alternatives for the future direction of the institution could be viewed either as the need for a fine tuning of existing mechanisms or as a need for major rebuilding. Mr. Masterton reported that the Subcommittee chose the second alternative and developed a series of recommendations in two categories, first, with respect to the specific

actions the Subcommittee believes are necessary to begin the restructuring process and second, with respect to general observations about areas which need attention. The recommendations for specific actions focus on the mission statement which the Subcommittee concludes is too vague to provide the policy direction relative to the institution's role within the statewide system. As a first step, the Trustees should address the institution's mission by setting forth a series of objectives for the institution which, over the next six months, would be examined and re-defined within an extensive academic planning process, to establish those objectives which will become the future mission statement of the institution. The Subcommittee recommended that 1) by January, 1978 the Chancellor should submit a statement of objectives for Portland-Gorham for approval of the Trustees and 2) the Chancellor and the administration draft a precise and well-defined mission statement for Portland-Gorham to be included in a final planning document to be submitted to the Board of Trustees by June, 1978.

3. Academic Planner. Mr. Masterton indicated that the second step is the academic plan. The Subcommittee feels that the planning should be a professional planning process which would require the establishment of an academic planner to prescribe boundaries, develop resource allocation plans, and establish priorities in line with the Statement of Objectives. Therefore the Subcommittee recommends that a planner be appointed and held responsible for preparing a planning document within the boundaries of the Statement of Objectives, and for submitting it to the Board of Trustees by June, 1978.

4. Administration. Mr. Masterton reported that the Subcommittee felt the number of positions reporting to the President should be limited to delineate clear lines of responsibility. The Subcommittee suggests that such positions which would represent a balanced number of reporting activities, would be in the areas of planning, finance, education and business operations. The Subcommittee further recommends that a Provost be appointed to fill the education position and to be the primary person responsible for the administration of the education component.

5. Other areas deserving attention. The Subcommittee identified a number of other areas deserving of serious consideration for which no specific recommendations were offered since it was decided that the Portland-Gorham administration should be responsible for developing detailed action plans in these areas:

Departments. Mr. Masterton noted that both the consultants' report and comments from the University community displayed great interest in departmental changes. The Subcommittee felt that such changes should follow sequentially from the planning process and the restructuring of activities, and with the involvement of the institution itself.

Non-traditional students. The Subcommittee recognizes that there are a number of problems in the Continuing Education program which resist simplistic solutions. Areas of accountability for quality need to be redefined; the special needs of part-time students and the relation of full-time faculty to part-time students should be reviewed. Mr. Masterton reported on two studies of Continuing Education which are underway at the present time. One is the system-wide study mandated by the Green Book recommendations and the second is a local study under the supervision of a Portland-Gorham campus committee. The Subcommittee believes that these two

studies should be considered as part of the planning process.

Law and Research. The Subcommittee has not explored these areas in depth, but it finds both the Law School and the Center for Research and Advanced Study commendable. CRAS is developing into a fine research facility despite limited resources and the Subcommittee suggests it is timely to evaluate its mission in terms of the overall plan for the institution and how it relates to the delivery of education. Opportunities are perceived for closer relationships between the faculty, research and student components and, specifically, opportunities for joint appointments in the future. With respect to the Law School, the Subcommittee believes it should continue to pursue its mission as a professional school for full time students preparing for the practice of law, resisting pressures to restructure the School or broaden its objectives to include evening or part-time offerings.

Permanent Appointments. The Subcommittee recognizes that the number of deanships and administrative positions currently filled by temporary appointments is detrimental to the progress of the institution. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the planning process be completed before appointments are made to fill the positions on a permanent basis.

Funding. The Subcommittee found evidence of some funding inequities but it does not believe that funding is the first priority in attacking the problems of the institution. Mr. Masterton noted that the Board, as a matter of policy, has already established that salaries are one of its highest priorities but salary problems are not unique to Portland-Gorham and extensive studies are underway to evaluate the salary situation, system-wide. To address funding inequities at Portland-Gorham, the Subcommittee believes it is critical to ascertain, through the planning sequence, where the emphasis should be directed and to establish the priorities for future funding.

Future Guidelines. The Subcommittee concludes that there was insufficient planning and funding for the merger when it was initiated, and that many of the present problems evolved from the early insufficiencies. Despite that, the Subcommittee believes that Portland-Gorham has been flexible in dealing with the emerging needs of its constituents and that it merits the support and confidence of the community and the system. Mr. Masterton indicated that the steps recommended by the Subcommittee for restructuring the institution are designed to provide an orderly sequence to resolve the problems.

On conclusion of Mr. Masterton's summary of the report, Chairman Page invited comments on the report before the Trustees discussed the recommendations and several persons responded from floor.

Acting Dean Paulette French read a prepared statement of the views of the College of Arts and Sciences faculty. She reported that the CAS faculty had met to formally consider the recommendations in the consultants' report and that their reactions, which were substantially supportive, had been transmitted to the Subcommittee. Dean French noted that CAS faculty did not take formal action on the Subcommittee's report but she indicated that her impression of shared faculty opinion follows roughly these lines:

- a. The faculty are concerned that governance by consensus as well as participatory planning are now threatened by a new concept of administrative fiat and that a major shift in decision-making is about to be institutionalized;
- b. the faculty would feel more comfortable if the post of Academic Planner were to be filled by appointment of someone from UMPG's own ranks;
- c. there is intensive concern over the recommendation which provides that the Academic Planner and Provost in concert with the President might recommend related but separate departments on each campus. Some faculty feel this suggests subdivisions among academic disciplines which might be divisive and inimical to department unity.
- d. with respect to budget and faculty salary inequities, CAS consensus is that action on inequities between Portland-Gorham and other campuses in the system should not be further delayed.

Other individuals who had comments to record on various aspects of the Subcommittee report were Harold Brown, Professor of Music; Haig Najarian, Professor of Biology; William Slavick, Associate Professor of English; Robert Connally, member of the Student Senate; Thomas Carper, Associate Professor of English; Irwin Novak, Associate Professor of Geology; Alan Smith, Professor of Chemistry and Charles Armentrout, Associate Professor of Physics.

Professor Brown endorsed the Subcommittee recommendations for the name change and refinement of the mission statement and urged the Trustees to address the institution's financial problems. He had reservations about the need for appointment of an Academic Planner and expressed confidence that existing staff had the capacity to undertake the necessary planning. Professor Najarian questioned whether the Subcommittee had not exceeded its charge in view of its emphasis on the mission and operation of the institution. He felt that the major part of the Subcommittee report dealt with substantive issues of mission and goals as opposed to identification of advantages and disadvantages of the merger which might be applicable to other possible consolidations within the system. He expressed concern that if the Subcommittee recommendations were carried out, responsibility for setting directions for and the operation of the institution, would rest with the Board and the Chancellor's Office, to the exclusion of those involved with Portland-Gorham programs. In response to Professor Najarian's concerns, Mr. Masterton elaborated on the charge to the Subcommittee on Structure which evolved from the earlier ad hoc Academic Planning Committee study. He indicated that the Subcommittee was expected to study the merger since its inception, identify any problems associated with the merger, along with major areas of concern and the most critical areas which need more intensive inquiry and, finally, to develop a series of recommendations based on their study.

Professor Slavick suggested that the main problem at Portland-Gorham is not structure or organization but lack of leadership. He urged the Trustees to recognize 1) that structural change will not solve the problems; 2) that what is needed is effective

leadership acting fairly and professionally within the established, traditional decision-making context; 3) that an Academic Planner with extraordinary powers, not answerable to the collegial process will have destructive and long term bad effect on responsible University self-governance; 4) that if a Planner is to be appointed, the appointee should come, with excellent credentials, from outside UMP-G and the University of Maine; 5) that there is a contradiction in the Subcommittee's commitment to the merger while recommending the division of large departments into separate campus departments; 6) that postponement of Board attention to UMP-G salary inequities should not occasion further postponement of internal correction of salary inequities; and, finally, he requested that 7) the Board direct the President to carry out its recommendations within the established campus governance procedure.

Robert Connally, UMP-G Student Senate, suggested that the planning committee should be made up of campus people and he urged the Trustees to recognize that underfunding is a major problem. Mr. Connally objected to a reference in the Subcommittee report that ". . . Portland-Gorham is not intended to be a "university center . . ." Since some of the earlier speakers had raised the point as well, Mr. Masterton endeavored to clarify the issue. He suggested that the problem in this instance seemed to be one of semantics rather than substance and that the phrase had been overemphasized out of context. In its entirety, the reference cited is "The University of Maine at Portland-Gorham is clearly not intended to be a "university center" in the sense that it duplicates the programs at Orono or any other campus." Mr. Masterton explained that the Subcommittee only intended to convey that the institution's mission should be unique to its constituency and not a duplicate of other programs elsewhere.

Professor Carper spoke to the ramifications of establishing related but separate departments on each campus. He endorsed the name change and the alternate academic organization proposed in the consultants' report, which he felt would function to create a unified institution with campus roles clearly defined. Professor Novak observed that many of the institution's problems are related to inadequate funding. He recommended that the Portland-Gorham mission should include the full range of undergraduate programs normally associated with a university, plus graduate programs to meet the needs of the people of Southern Maine. He noted that it is important to recognize that the University can't avoid duplication of programs, and the inherent costs, given its commitment to serve widely separated sections of the State. Professor Smith indicated that many individuals and groups at Portland-Gorham are eager to help the institution resolve its problems and they look to the Board for the financial means to accomplish these goals. He suggested that the fiscal side of the problem may be as important as any question of structure, planning, mission or other aspects which are, quite properly, part of the Subcommittee report. Professor Armentrout discussed the demoralizing impact of the financial problems on the Physics Department, of which he is a member.

There being no further presentations from the floor Dr. Evans moved that the Trustees begin discussion of the Subcommittee recommendations. The motion was seconded and carried. At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Masterton presented the recommendations for action individually.

Mr. Masterton moved that the Board of Trustees reaffirm the merger of the Portland-Gorham campuses and pledge its support to continued improvement of the merged institution.

The motion was seconded and VOTED.

Mr. Masterton moved that the name of the institution be changed from the University of Portland-Gorham to the University of Southern Maine, effective July, 1978. The motion was seconded. Dr. Donovan moved to amend the motion by incorporating a provision for appointment of a Committee on Designation to recommend one or more new names for action of the Board at the May meeting, the name change to be effective on July 1, 1978. The amendment was seconded. Mr. Masterton indicated that he could support the amendment as long as there was affirmation of the intent to change the name and an appropriate means selected to accomplish the change. Mr. Monaghan objected to delaying action on this issue which he regarded as very significant and further expressed disappointment at the apparent lack of support from committee members and those from the Portland-Gorham community who were present. Mr. Brown indicated that after serious consideration he had decided he could support the name change and inquired about the reason for a proposed delay. Dr. Donovan, Mrs. Kominsky and Dr. Evans also endorsed the need for a name change but each indicated they thought the Board should provide time for consideration of a number of alternatives. After further discussion, Chairman Page called for a vote on the Donovan amendment which CARRIED with Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Monaghan and Mr. Brown dissenting.

With Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Monaghan, Mr. Brown and Mrs. DiMatteo dissenting, and Dr. Evans, Dr. Donovan, Mr. Masterton, Mrs. Kominsky and Mr. Page voting in favor, the amended resolution was CARRIED:

Resolved: Whereas the present name of the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham is itself divisive, the name of the institution will be changed effective July 1, 1978. A Trustee Committee on Designation will be appointed by the Chairman to recommend one or more new names prior to the May meeting of the Board of Trustees.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that the Board of Trustees request and receive from the Chancellor a statement of objectives for the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham for their review and approval at the January, 1978 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that the Board request from the Chancellor and the Administration a precise, well-defined mission statement for the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham, and that it be included in the Planning Report submitted to the full Board by June, 1978.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that an Academic Planner will be appointed immediately and held responsible for the preparation of a Planning Report within the boundaries of the Statement of Objectives to be submitted to the Board by June, 1978 and to be implemented over a 12-month period beginning July, 1978.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that a new position of Provost be created at the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham and that the Provost be the first ranking academic officer under the President for administering, coordinating and developing all academic activities and functions of the institution.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that a major restructuring of the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham will be proposed in the Planning Report to include, but not be limited to, administration, departmental structure, organization and location, non-traditional learning, law and research.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that Senior administrative appointments will not be made on a permanent basis until the restructuring has been completed, academic plans have been completed, Provost has been appointed, and the Planning Report has been approved by the Board of Trustees.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that the funding necessary to implement and support the planning function will be made available to the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham.

On motion of Mr. Masterton which was seconded, it was

Resolved: that consolidation of other units of the University should be examined in light of the collective mission of the University of Maine, the current mission of the existing units, and the

proposed mission of the consolidation, noting that the mission of any proposed consolidation should be specifically defined and include stated objectives that will serve the constituents of the proposed institution.

Adjournment.



JoAnne R. Magill
Clerk of the Board