

# Student Services Team Presentation

**Charge:** Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one campus, or consolidation at SW of functions that support significant enrollment growth and student attainment through outsourcing, automation, intercampus collaboration, process standardization, and other means TBD by the team.

**Scope:** All functions related to recruitment and admissions, financial aid, registrar, and support systems for student retention and completion.

**Goals:** Reduce operating costs. Align with UA priorities. Identify targeted investments. Improve student experience.



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA

*Many Traditions One Alaska*

UA Strategic Pathways  
January 18, 2017

# Team Members

- ▶ Alex Fitts
- ▶ Dave Fitzgerald
- ▶ Stephen Gray
- ▶ Alison Hayden
- ▶ Barbara Hegel
- ▶ Mary Kreta
- ▶ Joe Nelson
- ▶ Julie Parshall
- ▶ Saichi Oba
- ▶ Bruce Schultz
- ▶ Joey Sweet
- ▶ Jonathon Taylor
- ▶ Lora Volden
- ▶ Jen Jarvis

# Key Stakeholders

- ▶ Students
- ▶ Faculty
- ▶ Staff
- ▶ Executive Leadership
- ▶ Community
- ▶ Employers
- ▶ Parents
- ▶ Alumni
- ▶ Legislators
- ▶ K-12 administrators and teachers
- ▶ Partners – Community, Governmental, Non-Profit, Other Universities and Colleges
- ▶ Funders – Corporations

# Options

Option 1 – Lead Campus (each campus leading a function)

Option 2 – Consolidate All Functions at One Campus

Option 3 – Consolidation at Statewide

Option 4 – Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide

# Option 1: Lead Campus (each campus leading a function)

Each campus would become the “lead” in a particular area.

For example:

- ▶ Recruitment and Admissions at UAF
- ▶ Registrar at UAA
- ▶ Financial Aid at UAS

The other universities would maintain reduced staffing in the “non-lead” areas in order to provide necessary services to students. Lead campuses increase staffing to manage additional responsibilities.

# Option 1: Pros and Cons

## Pros

- ▶ Still have some support at each campus with the representation of a function
- ▶ Opportunity to take advantage of existing strengths
- ▶ Efficiency in economy of scale
- ▶ Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure process
- ▶ Creation of a more common process for students

## Cons

- ▶ Significant leadership challenge and professional liability
- ▶ Community, faculty, student and staff perception of decreased services and availability
- ▶ Loss of collaboration and synergy between campuses
- ▶ Diminished effectiveness and efficiency due to three different sets of business and academic policies, processes and dates
- ▶ Increased sense of bureaucracy



# Option 1: Further Analysis Needed

- ▶ What would the process be to determine what function would reside at what campus?
- ▶ What are the relationships between all other campuses and lead campus and how would they be facilitated?
- ▶ Could more than one function reside at a campus?
- ▶ What would the reporting structure and authorities be? What would the level of decision making for each non-lead campus?
- ▶ How would we measure effects on student experience?
- ▶ How would a system of accountability be developed and maintained?
- ▶ What would cost savings be for options and would services be improved?
- ▶ What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), Department of Education financial aid oversight?
- ▶ What would campus branding look like in the lead model?
- ▶ What would formalized collaboration between the 3 campuses need to be?



# Option 2: Consolidate All Functions at One Campus

Consolidate Offices of the Registrar, Financial Aid, and Recruitment and Admissions' responsibilities and functions to one university with support staff on the other campuses.

- ▶ Each university will still maintain its own unique branding.
- ▶ Recruitment would focus on matching students to the right institution.

This option would likely drive policy and process change to create one procedure for the many administrative functions in financial aid, registrar and admissions offices.



# Option 2: Pros and Cons

## Pros

- ▶ Opportunity for improved consistency in decision making and policies
- ▶ Potential for efficiency in economy of scale
- ▶ Opportunity to implement a unified recruitment strategy that maps prospective student interest in particular academic program offerings -- instead of university affinity or campus location
- ▶ Recruitment could have cost savings
- ▶ Eliminate redundancy

## Cons

- ▶ Significant leadership challenge and professional liability
- ▶ Community, faculty, and staff perception of decreased services and availability
- ▶ Loss of collaboration and synergy between campuses
- ▶ Maintaining clear and transparent decision making that addresses needs of students at all campuses
- ▶ Implementation process includes external decision makers (stakeholders) that have competing interests



# Option 2: Further Analysis Needed

- ▶ What would cost savings be for this option and how would services be improved?
- ▶ What would the process be to determine which university owns all functions?
- ▶ What are the relationships between all other campuses and lead campus and how would they be facilitated?
- ▶ What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), Department of Education financial aid oversight?
- ▶ What would the reporting structure and authorities be? What would the level of decision making be for each non-consolidated campus?
- ▶ What would campus branding look like in the consolidated model?
- ▶ How would the voices for other universities be incorporated during the decision making process?

# Option 3: Consolidation at Statewide

Registrar, Financial Aid, Recruitment and Admissions offices will be consolidated at a single Statewide office titled “Enrollment Services”.

- ▶ Individual Registrar, Admissions, and Financial Aid Offices would no longer exist at UAF, UAA, and UAS.
- ▶ This office would be responsible for all Admission, Financial Aid, and Registrar functions for the entire University of Alaska.
- ▶ Staffing available at each campus to support and direct students in person.

# Option 3: Pros and Cons

## Pros

- ▶ Eliminate redundancy
- ▶ Consistency in decision making and policies
- ▶ Efficiency in economy of scale
- ▶ Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure process

## Cons

- ▶ Removed from direct student experience
- ▶ Potential for each university's students to experience an increased sense of bureaucracy resulting from authority/responsibility being located far away from service delivery points
- ▶ Impact on service to faculty
- ▶ Knowing and managing policies at 3 different universities
- ▶ Universities removal from process and decision making



# Option 3: Further Analysis Needed

- ▶ What would the reporting structure (matrix) and authorities be? What would the level of decision making be for each campus?
- ▶ What are the relationships between the universities and Statewide? How would these relationships be facilitated?
- ▶ What would happen to Anchorage/Juneau employees not willing/able to relocate to Fairbanks?
- ▶ What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), DOE financial aid oversight?
- ▶ What would cost savings be for options and would services be improved?
- ▶ What would campus branding would look like?
- ▶ How would voices for other universities be incorporated during the decision making process?
- ▶ Would change involve a shift physically or just reporting structure?
- ▶ How would Statewide be demystified to university stakeholders?
- ▶ Would option elevate level of priority of student services?
- ▶ How would this option help us achieve long term goals and vision?

# Option 4: Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide

Generic tasks and processes are consolidated between Universities and Statewide.

- ▶ Tasks equally distributed to each university and Statewide
- ▶ Face to face services are maintained at each campus

# Sample Lists of Tasks

## Financial Aid Activities

- ▶ Automated Federal Data exchange, ISIR, Pell, Loan, COD, NSLDS
- ▶ Military TA (Tuition Assistance) processing
- ▶ Tax verification
- ▶ Budget need sheets
- ▶ Scholarship
- ▶ Centrally automate financial aid communications

## Retention Activities

- ▶ Provide predictive analytics/software for retention and support (this is where opportunity for centralized retention effort)
  - Including holistic picture of student
  - With accountability for the university
  - Retention Rx (example)
  - Centralized data for units

## Registrar Activities

- ▶ Enrollment verification
- ▶ Transcript processing
- ▶ Alaska state residency (UA Owner)

## Recruitment Activities

- ▶ Getting all the names of the high school juniors and seniors in state and supply to Universities
- ▶ Accept letters
- ▶ Automated admission for appropriate degree (ex. associate of arts)
- ▶ Centralized backroom admissions
- ▶ Provide predictive data relating to recruitment investigate centralized data house vs. data housed at universities



# Option 4: Pros and Cons

## Pros

- ▶ Take advantage of existing strengths
- ▶ Potential for reallocation of resources and process innovation
- ▶ Eliminate redundancy
- ▶ Efficiency in economy of scale
- ▶ Potential for reduction in costs

## Cons

- ▶ Removal from process and decision making
- ▶ Political perception of Statewide owning tasks
- ▶ Perception of Statewide growing



# Option 4: Further Analysis Needed

- ▶ Who would be evaluating the performance of task areas and what would the criteria be?
- ▶ What does the ideal structure look like and what will be plan for reevaluation?
- ▶ How would relationships be managed between each university and statewide?
- ▶ What voice will other campuses have if task handling is not working for them?
- ▶ How do you monitor both internal and external customer service levels?
- ▶ What would the process be for picking the correct tasks and owners of tasks (ex., cost, service to students, time, structure, expertise, etc.)?
- ▶ How would the voices for other universities be incorporated during the decision making process?
- ▶ What would the communication plan be to students and stakeholders to create certainty and relieve anxiety regarding changes?

# Q&A

