

University of Alaska Academic Structure Change Management

Focus: Science, Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences

Session Notes, August 2019

First Session (Fairbanks and on-line)

Overall Session Goals:

- In a focused, systematic way, address changes being advanced by the University of Alaska Board of Regents in response to the current financial crisis and in service of the long-term vision for the university.
- Surface and address conflicting interests; identify and advance common interests.
- Generate constructive options and, to the extent possible, consensus recommendations.

Overall Note:

- This document is the product of brainstorming and dialogue. It is designed to be generative not definitive – as a way of providing broader input into the responses to the Board of Regents than might have happened otherwise. It does include options and some consensus recommendations, all of which need to be understood as the inputs of a diverse set of participants, but not the final word on any of these issues.

Welcome:

- This is to talk about science, arts, and humanities at the university of Alaska
- A conversation about the university and the future
- We have had a lot of turmoil and stress with the budget
 - That will still be a challenge going forward
- But what can we do for the university
- The Board has directed us to address potential integration and possible accreditation as a single university
 - It will be a continuing conversation – not a one-time session
- There have been a series of reductions over the years – mostly addressed through attrition and small cuts, resulting in weaker programs
- Now it is a bigger additional cut – so it is a critical point where we need to ask how we move forward
- This is meant to be a broad group
- There are 8 groups for these discussions and there are issues across these groups that will be needed

First Alaskans Institute Agreements:

- In Every Chair, a Leader
- Speak to be Understood; Listen to Understand
- Be Present; Be Engaged
- Value Our Time Together
- Safe Space for Meaningful Conversation
- Challenges → Solutions
- Takest Thou Hats Off
- Our Value of Humor Helps Us
- We are Responsible for Our Experience
- Take Care of Yourself; Take Care of Each Other

Additional Proposed Groundrules:

- Focus on interest and options – avoid jumping to positions.
- Be hard on the issues, not each other.
- Operate with transparency – notes will be recorded live on a cloud-based, shared document.
- Be mindful of the time available in each session; issues that can't be resolved during the session will be placed on a "parking lot" in the notes.
- Limit electronics during the session to what advances the conversation; observers may communicate (in person or electronically) with participants with whom they have connections before and after the sessions, but should only serve as observers during the sessions.
- Ensuring everyone can talk – in a systematic way

Additional question:

- What is the outcome of this session?
 - This is to explore options
 - Recommendations to the President and the Board will take into account what emerges from this process
- The Board is meeting tomorrow on the financial situation – the budget has not yet been finalized with the Governor

Material generated in advance of the session and included in the session notes:

Academic Structure Change Management Working Group: Arts, Sciences and Humanities: UAA Contingent

In an effort to provide structure and focus for our participation in this discussion, a number of the UAA faculty appointees to the Arts, Sciences and Humanities working group of the Academic Structure Change Management effort met to discuss our responsibilities relative to this discussion. That effort produced the following perspective. We invite our colleagues from across the MAUs to join us in using this document as a guide for participation in this discussion.

Concerns regarding the premise of this meeting

1. Status Quo: The circumstances under which the working group was constituted have changed and, therefore, the charge given by the BOR to develop a model for consolidation should be reconsidered. Minimally, we should be considering the two models discussed at the July 30 Board of Regents meeting rather than a single option.
2. Timeline: At the very least, the time committed to these discussions and data collection must be extended well beyond the very limited window presently allocated.
3. Faculty Governance: All three MAUs have governance processes in place to address questions such as this. The extant governance structures should be engaged to guide the process. Faculty Senate leadership and all department chairs should be involved.
4. Financial Exigency: Faculty Members' ability to participate, plan, criticize and evaluate options is hampered by the absence of tenure. Financial exigency must be rescinded before faculty input can be considered legitimate & meaningful.

Principles to which we'll adhere in the discussion:

1. We will not make this discussion about turf. We respect the value of the academic programs offered at each MAU and their unique missions to serve the needs of their communities.

2. We consider it premature to focus on program consolidation or reductions, faculty layoffs, shifts in curricular control and the like.
3. We will focus on the determination of objective criteria by which the relevance of the aforementioned considerations would be determined and substantive decisions about institutional structure evaluated.
4. We consider excellence in research & creative activity, teaching and service as our starting points and fundamental values in the determination of more specific criteria.
5. We commit to find the best solutions to continue to serve the needs of our communities and meet other objectives we agree as a group should be prioritized

Change Management Model:

Phase 1: Hopes & Fears (60 min.)

Phase 2: Vision & Data (60 min.)

Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests (60 min.)

Phase 4: Alignment & Options (60 + Session 2)

Phase 5: Recommendations & Implementation (Session 2)

Phase 1a: Hopes

- Hope that this will allow us to build and strengthen current collaborations across the state and across program areas
 - To be seen as a way to enable organic collaboration from the bottom up
- Maintaining diversity of programs at all campuses – so students get a real college experience
- The process will be forward looking – developing sustainable solutions, not just reacting to the current budget situation
- Faculty will be listened in this process to by the Board of Regents
- The process can enhance a sense of trust in the shared values we have across all campuses
- Opportunity to highlight current collaborations – such as Native Studies Council – maintaining local control
- Respect the differences of the regions served – addressing the unique needs of regions whether with an integrative model or not
- Build and improve on the successes we have to better serve students
- Come out of this process with a better understanding of what each of the units do
- Continued integration of all campus faculty into disciplinary departments, as well as interdisciplinary initiatives, and increased emphasis on expanded offering that would benefit students across the state
- The native/indigenous studies will be holistic and interdisciplinary to include arts, science, health, and traditional knowledge
- Ensuring students stay at the center of our thoughts and focus
- Building on the collaboration with fisheries, as a result of strategic pathways, there are now more opportunities
 - Potential across marine sciences more broadly
 - Unexpected result of external force, but a good example of collaboration
- Find ways to share and be more effective with our resources
 - Example of philosophy being in danger of disappearing at UAF and a bottom-up faculty model is now working across campuses
- Hope that students will have a more seamless experience across the university, so they can graduate on time and so faculty can offer a more diverse mix of special topics
- Hope that students will have access to Master's degree and Ph.D. programs across science, arts, and humanities

- The decision making process will not be only driven by finances – that we will keep student needs at the core
- A hope to organize the diversity – to educate the leaders to face the challenges of the 21st century
 - With more coast line than the rest of the states combined, we need to lead on fisheries and other topics
 - We need to learn to be systems thinkers so we can educate students as systems thinkers for the future
 - This is foundational for who we are
 - Be agile in organizing ourselves to match the effect we want to have in society
- Hope there is sufficient administrative support should we move to single accreditation
- Hope that the voices of 27,000 students (17,000 FTEs) and the many community members are heard in this process
- Hope that we can continue to serve students well, including those without access (GER process was helpful, but limited by finances)
 - Appreciation that the faculty senate has supported the ANT graduation requirement (Alaska Native Themed Course Requirement)
- Faculty will assert and control curriculum
- Authentic, equitable, and representative faculty governance
 - Including this as a hastily convened meeting
- Take into account different scheduling for different needs – such as course blocks that take into account commuting students
- Hope to look first to expenditures in administration and other matters that are in addition or separate to the mission
- Maintain uniqueness of campuses – UAA, UAF, UAS, and community campuses
 - Build on on-line capabilities of community campuses
 - Maintaining uniqueness of colleges and programs
- A hope to preserve programs that are successful – especially those that have earned national attention
- As we are talking about change, that we make sure we have shared governance, including faculty and staff
- A hope for greater efficiency in course offering
- We take this opportunity to design a system that can adjust and evolve as the world we serve evolves
- A hope that we look into catalogues and appreciate unique offerings that are serving unique populations

Phase 1b: Fears

- Fear that we would lose accreditation
- The meeting will be used to legitimize the president’s plan through token faculty participation
- We will conflate university structure with budget reductions – they are separate processes, each with different pros and cons
 - To do structure and then budget reductions would be unnecessarily complicated
- Fear of combining consolidation and accreditation together when they are distinct
- We could, through not doing an ideal job, prevent students – rural and urban – from accessing a good education
- The smaller campuses will no longer exist and it will just be UAA and UAF – with UAS and community campuses ending up smaller
- Ignoring the complexity of the merger in a single accreditation will do harm to students – with unintended consequences
- Rural and Native interests will be lost in the conversation

- Hasty decisions without thorough analysis and data to support taken into account
- A fear of job loss – for ourselves and our colleagues (faculty and staff)
- The cost of the process will not be appropriately evaluated (this meeting alone could cost \$20,000 and there are additional emotional costs in the process)
- Where we have interdisciplinary units and degrees, a fear that they will be reorganized into disciplines
 - Unique programs will be harmed by managing from afar
- The long-term damage to the University of Alaska brand name if we rush this process – brain drain in loss of students and faculty from the state
- Our existing indigenous programs will be reorganized into existing western disciplines and categories – doing harm to indigenous community’s interests
- We will lose programs and students will then have fewer choices, resulting in loss of students who either drop out or transfer outside of Alaska
- The same issues will apply to graduate programs – to recruit and retain faculty it key to have Ph.D. programs and professional practice masters degree programs
- A fear that strategic pathways will be used as a way of marginalizing campuses that are not the lead
- A fear in smaller campuses that we will be viewed as a dumping ground for GERs – we all teach these courses and being limited to this on smaller campuses is a fear
- Don’t put this on the back of students
- The Board shouldn’t manufacture conflict among faculty
- A fear that whatever model is one we decided will lose geographic, cultural, and program differences in any move to create a one-Alaska model
 - Losing campus identities
- We are under a tight timeline – there is a glide path over a few years if the governor does approve – a concern that this will be seen as a need to reinvent the university within a few weeks
 - We are driving too fast and we need to think slow (in auto racing, when the track is fast, go slow in the cockpit)
- A meta-fear is that the outcome of this process when interpreted by the President and the Board of Regents will not take into account what has been represented here
 - The concerns and hopes expressed will be lost where they don’t serve the single consolidation and accreditation
 - This includes being open to alternatives to a single accreditation
- A concern that general education requirements not just be larger classes or on-line – as boxes to check, rather than real education
- A fear with the more general reorganization will result in duplicative programs being seen as a bad thing, missing the point that effective and transformative teaching needs to be face to face rather than on-line, which could be the result of combining programs
- A fear that only quantitative data will be used in decision making
- A fear that we are compartmentalized in working groups in this process and campuses with distance learning will be marginalized
- A concern that the meetings have been broken up – with research separate
 - There should not be the sense that this is separate with research
 - Not all colleges separate research into centers and institutes – so that is fully integrated
 - Research and academics have synergy – we are a research university and many of the graduate programs are key to the nation – this is very important for student and faculty opportunities and the leadership we have, such as in arctic research

Phase 2a: Elements of a Future Success Vision – 2025

- We would be a center for excellence in research, teaching, skills development, creative activities, and public service in an open enrollment context – in all of our regions
- A well-funded university providing as high or higher quality education to the diverse student body we currently have while simultaneously maintaining world class research for the state, nation, and world – maintaining our status as one of the leading universities in the arctic
- Robust stable and appropriately state funded academic programs under the direction of faculty
- Valued in the state regardless of the political context or affiliation
- Accreditation is not messed up (and not messing up in general)
- Reversing brain drain with desirable programs increasing enrollment in state and from outside the state
- The whole UA system is invigorated and thriving through sustained disciplinary strength and, importantly, increased interdisciplinary integration across the arts, humanities, and STEM fields, both in teaching and research, which is important to preparing students for the workforce and for helping society address major challenges of the 21st century.
 - See the National Academies report “Branches from the Same Tree” for guidance and data on the value of interdisciplinary integration: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/24988/the-integration-of-the-humanities-and-arts-with-sciences-engineering-and-medicine-in-higher-education>
- We have closed equity gaps in student success (low income, first gen, Alaska Native, part time students, etc.)
- Quality education that includes respect for and knowledge of all the indigenous cultures of Alaska
- Higher enrollment, lower cost, R1 university status, larger impact on the economics of the state of Alaska
- Robust and diverse research – graduate and undergraduate programs – responsive to local needs and global challenges – increasing the strength of the entire UA system
- Accountability and transparency in resource allocation
- Flexibility and responsiveness to community needs
- Access to higher education for Alaskans – recognizing the place-bound nature of the student body
- Community engagement and presence for development support and service
- Reinforced trust and perception of value with the public
- Achieve sufficient financial stability to grow or at least get back to where we were in terms of tenure track faculty and programs
- Adjust to the budget reductions with as little negative impact as possible on students and programs
- Not being in what seems to be a constant state of crisis – operating in more of a normal mode
- Devolution of authority for planning, execution and assessment for programming and change
 - A reinvigorated value for faculty, staff, and student governance – as a value for the university as a whole – with governance bodies showing leadership in the face of challenges working closely with administration
- Collaboration across the system – particularly in providing curriculum – rather than what feels like competition
- Leading the state in sustainable development thought and practice
- The university is a source of life-long learning – with strong engaged alumni
- Three universities capable of realizing their distinctive excellences and capable of serving their distinctive regional needs

- Continuous process improvement business models
- A world-class indigenous studies entity (college, program, research, etc.)
- Founded on the basis of critical learning and critical thinking
- A leaner administration with resources being put toward the academic programs
- There may be a shared vision for higher education in Alaska, with distinct visions on separate campuses

Phase 2b: Relevant and Available Data

- Explanation of I/R data
- Draft: August 19, 2019, 6:12AM (By: John Petraitis)
- Data Sources
- The following two data sources were used to pull official I/R data for each arts, sciences, and humanities program across the state in 2018-2019:

- <https://ancpowerbireporting.>

[uaa.alaska.edu/reports/powerbi/UAA/IR%20Reports/Leadership/UAA%20Course%20Tuition%20by%20Faculty%20Pay?rs:Embed=true](https://ancpowerbireporting.uaa.alaska.edu/reports/powerbi/UAA/IR%20Reports/Leadership/UAA%20Course%20Tuition%20by%20Faculty%20Pay?rs:Embed=true)

- <https://ancpowerbireporting.>

[uaa.alaska.edu/reports/powerbi/UAA/IR%20Reports/Students/Students/UAA%20Official%20Student%20Demographic%20Closing?rs:Embed=true](https://ancpowerbireporting.uaa.alaska.edu/reports/powerbi/UAA/IR%20Reports/Students/Students/UAA%20Official%20Student%20Demographic%20Closing?rs:Embed=true)

Ten Key variables

1. number of sections offered in Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Summer 2019
 - e.g., Alaska Native Studies (AKNS) at UAA had 25 sections
2. the combined number of students in those sections
 - e.g., AKNS had 407 students in those 25 sections
3. the combined SCH in those sections
 - e.g., AKNS had 1,277 student credit hours in those 25 sections
4. the combined total tuition collected by the MAU for those sections.
 - E.g., students paid \$271,990 in tuition for those 25 sections
 - Note: this is 100% of the tuition paid for the courses, NOT the tuition revenue that is returned to the unit, e.g, 60% or 80%)
5. the combined salaries paid to the faculty who taught those sections
 - E.g., Faculty were paid \$240,070.97 to teach those 25 sections
 - Note: two sections of the same course (e.g., PHIL A101) will have two different salaries
 - such that a tenure-track faculty member earning \$65,000 annually would contribute \$6,500 (10% of a 30-unit workload) to the total combined salaries, while an adjunct earning \$5,603 would contribute less to this total.
 - the difference between #4 and #5 above (essentially, instructional ROI)
 - Note: Because #4 above is based on 100% of tuition, not a smaller amount that is returned to units/colleges, positive values do not always mean that a department produced profit for the unit/college. Negative values, however, always signify that a department earned less tuition than the faculty were paid.
6. a key performance indicator (KPI) that ranges from +1.0000 to -1.0000 based on #6 above where
 - the higher the value the more financially efficient the instruction
 - Note: two departments that have the same value on #6 above (e.g., +\$120,000 for each), but have different KPI such that the department that produces that ROI with lower faculty salaries will have a higher KPI.
7. the number of undergrad majors in Spring 2019
8. the number of masters students in Spring 2019

9. the number of doctoral students in Spring 2019

Discussion:

- The three IR officers should review the data before sharing – the data warehouses are not always correct
 - This is program data on the IR website is pulled from banner
- AAUP has a document on the role of the faculty in financial situations
 - There should be a chance to render an assessment on the university's financial situation – a detailed account of administrative spending, including an accounting of reserves from faculty leaving the system (which becomes unrestricted funding)
- Consortium model is added to the appendix of this document
- A question on what are we providing data to answer?
- A need to generate a list of open data questions, beyond what is available by Friday
- It would be good to know what the anticipated savings would be from the plans that are being developed
- A question on whether the data should be shared
 - A concern that we fixate on data that exists rather than what makes a good university, for which metrics don't exist – such as life-long learners, etc.
- Critical data are who are our students
 - There are differences in preparation for college, how many work part time, how many are veterans, etc.
 - This is critical in order to know how best to be prepared to serve them
- There are special accreditations in each of the operating units, which is part of the data on what a quality university is (such as required faculty size)
 - Difficult to consolidate by Friday
- If there is data – it should be UAA, UAF, UAS, community campuses
 - Note that the dashboards have had extensive input in creating these data collections that are in discussion
 - A request by IR officers to review before distribution
- The travel management system has been consolidated – can we learn from savings and gains or losses in service quality?
 - Other back offices have been consolidated
 - Might they be assessed for outsourcing, not just consolidation
- An index of community partnerships would be helpful
 - Partnerships among universities
 - Partnerships in community that might be impacted by proposed changes
- A discussion of research centers and work in addressing community needs
- An index of student services
- KPIs have not been completely vetted – good work has gone into these, but more is needed and a sub-group could work on this
 - A key question on how we measure performance
- The Chancellor's budget plan is relevant data
- The data out of context could make things more complicated rather than less so
- There is a need for a clear purpose – is this about consolidation or is this about collaboration across campuses (not just three)
 - There are aspects of operations that may not be evident in the data
- This will be relevant across all 8 sessions that are happening this week
- Many people have access to the dashboards already – for others to do so would be worth thinking about so we all have the same data
- It would be helpful to have benchmarking data about corresponding universities, such as other R2 universities
- Extramural funding needs to be taken into account

- Important to attend to additional responsibilities of full-time faculty relative to adjuncts
- The models for cuts were made with data – there was a state-wide plan that already exists
 - This was \$70 million over three years and would be informative
- In 1987 there was the decision to have three universities in an earlier financial crisis – it would be helpful to see what was the data then
- A request to have data on anticipated savings from a consortia or a consolidation plan (and costs – organizational, branding, etc.)
 - Including cost of single accreditation (rebranding, faculty turnover, signage, lack of faculty buy in, loss of university donors, changes to existing donations, cost of building infrastructure for one university, growth of administrative overhead at statewide, opportunity costs as faculty and staff work on restructuring)
 - Alumni survey data that exists
 - Strong consensus in the room – unanimous
- Also a request to contribute to the data that is provided to the Board of Regents – to provide clarification and context

Process Suggestion:

- IR individuals pull together data to share before the Friday session

Additional comments:

- Is a major restructure necessary given the three-year glide path
- The IR data is too narrow and would lead to incomplete inputs into decision making

Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests

Stakeholders	Interests
All stakeholders (shared interests)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustainable higher education system and a sustainable society • Maintaining reputation and excellence of the university system
Undergraduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seamless access to educational opportunities – on campus, on line, regardless of location • Timely graduation (based on course availability) • Full support for advising, placement, student life, mentoring, and related matters • Respect for indigenous education and values • Internship and professional development opportunities, along with research and creative scholarship opportunities • International considerations – visa, etc. • Affordability and quality • Availability of pre-graduate and pre-professional courses and requirements • Better integration of high schoolers into programs (including dual enrollment opportunities) • Stability/continuity of programs • Robust liberal arts core for all students • Diversity of programs and choice (full spectrum) • Open access • Scholarship funding availability • Opportunities for study abroad • Integrating disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for community-engaged coursework • Production of graduates for high-need professions • Consideration for cultural diversity and equity • Holistic education grounded in face-to-face situated experiences that provide opportunities to build the social support, educational and professional networks critical to academic success • Access to honors programming across campuses • Commuter student access • Adult learner access
Graduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading-edge preparation for professional and scholarly careers • Diversity of programs and choice (full spectrum) • International considerations – visa, etc. • Scholarship funding availability • Continued access to western regional graduate program across all campus – allowing graduate students in Western states to pay resident tuition on UA campuses (expanding to include UAF) • Adequate funding for teaching assistantships • Ensuring adequate numbers of thesis advisors to advise graduate students on dissertations and masters theses • Integrating disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs • Professional development and internship opportunities • Opportunities for study abroad • Opportunities for community-engaged coursework • Dissertation completion fellowships • Production of graduates for high-need professions • Consideration for cultural diversity and equity • Access to research facilities, equipment, libraries, cyberinfrastructure, and ability to publish • Holistic education grounded in face-to-face situated experiences that provide opportunities to build the social support, educational and professional networks critical to academic success • Commuter student access • Adult learner access
Non-degree seeking students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility of time and space – delivery modes • Place-based learning • A diverse set of on-line offerings
Researchers, scholars, and creators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining and advancing areas of research excellence • Nurturing and sustaining emerging areas of research and scholarly opportunity • Respecting and supporting both funded and unfunded scholarly activity and research (valuing time – such as in the work load) • Opportunities for undergraduate and high school students • Keeping research connected with undergraduate and graduate students • The upkeep of facilities, including labs, instrumentation, cyberinfrastructure, etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respecting the ethical needs for community-based participatory research • Travel support to present findings • Attention to the contrast between tri-partite versus bi-partite roles (maintaining research identity and service identity for faculty across the faculties) and also the challenge of faculty who really want to be primarily teaching focused (work load issues) • Support for the libraries • Continuing access to sabbatical leaves for research, scholarship, and creative product production • Achieving impact and focus in research agenda and tracking impact • Academic integrity (connects to funded and unfunded research)
Faculty and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining unique identities of campuses and programs • Able to innovate in curriculum, including agile responses to emerging needs in society • Faculty and staff in community campuses not being seen as just handling GDRs • Ensuring authentic, equitable, and responsive faculty and staff governance • International considerations – visa, etc. • Not having burdensome changes in work load • Attention to the contrast between tri-partite versus bi-partite roles (maintaining research identity and service identity for faculty across the faculties) and also the challenge of faculty who really want to be primarily teaching focused (work load issue) • Stable jobs • Clear promotion and tenure guidelines (particularly under a single UA) • Salary equity and salaries that take into account inflation in cost of living • Childcare for faculty, staff, and students • Not adding additional work for faculty and staff for the same pay • Not having to leave present position to get a raise • Protections for non-tenure track faculty • Opportunities for faculty and staff development • Changes explained to people losing jobs – as covered by the collective bargaining agreement • Ability to attract and retain faculty and staff (continuity of benefits, for example) • Attention to increasing overloading of staff or unilateral changes in roles • Support for partnership research arrangements (including secondments) • Respect for shared governance
Alaska employers and industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talent that is capable on the job and adaptable as systems thinkers for the future (consistent levels of basic skills) • Access to student interns

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued focus on high impact job areas in Alaska • Stability of the trained workforce; employees who know what it is like to live in Alaska • Developing the next generation of professionals – long-term horizon • Partnerships connected to research activities and local campuses • Human skills to navigate changes across one’s career
Board of Regents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simultaneously being responsive to the current financial situation (to the governor, legislature, and citizens of the state) and responsive to university systems and processes for governance and decision making • Ensuring accreditation • Independence for political processes – the original intent for having a Board of Regents • Avoiding sanction by AAUP • Focusing on the mission of the university system • Responsible to the community of Alaska with transparency • Audited and un-filtered information on the state of the university’s finances • Protecting their legitimacy and reputation in this process – able to make adjustments given the change in the situation
Legislature and Governor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely, constructive, and effective actions by the University of Alaska – demonstrating responsiveness to the needs of the state • Acknowledgement of the Legislature’s authority in appropriating funds • An interest in a population of graduates who will remain in the state • Maintaining the Ted Stevens legislative internships (soon to be open to graduate students) • Advancing economic and resource development (identifying new sources of revenue for the state that can come from the university) • Understanding fully what a modern university is and can be in Alaska – as a connector to the people they serve • Being able to “do less with less” according to the Governor (the legislature did not agree)
Funding agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A source of innovation with new proposals and ideas • Confidence that the University will deliver on commitments under grants and contracts (stability) • Compliance with research policies and procedures (Title IX, IRB, etc.)
Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts continue to be embedded successfully and deeply in community • University as a source of collaboration with arts organizations (including student pathways to future careers) • Significant facility needs addressed (studio, concert halls, etc. and class sizes matched to learning in these settings) • Importance of protecting free inquiry – particularly research on environmental impacts and climate change

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of collaboration between the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and the arts • Special accreditation • Integration of Indigenous and local knowledge into all research and disciplines • Interrogation of values and ethical obligations • Supporting conditions for critical thinking and thoughtful dialogue with equitable opportunities
Humanities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of protecting free inquiry – particularly research on environmental impacts and climate change • The fundamental importance of research in the humanities, with access to libraries, sabbaticals, etc. • The importance of collaboration between the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and arts • Special accreditation • Not just regulated to service teaching with GERs – respected as our own disciplines • Integration of Indigenous and local knowledge into all research and disciplines • Interrogation of values and ethical obligations • Contemplation of the fundamental nature of reality • Supporting conditions for critical thinking and thoughtful dialogue with equitable opportunities
Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant facility needs addressed (labs, class sizes matched to lab learning) • Fundamental importance of research and integration with instruction • Importance of protecting free inquiry – particularly research on environmental impacts and climate change • Access to sufficient numbers of TAs for lab courses • The importance of collaboration between the humanities, sciences, and social sciences • Special accreditation • Integration of Indigenous and local knowledge into all research and disciplines • Supporting conditions for critical thinking and thoughtful dialogue with equitable opportunities
Social Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant facility needs addressed (labs, class sizes matched to lab learning) • Importance of protecting free inquiry – particularly research on environmental impacts and climate change • The importance of collaboration between the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and arts • Sufficient access to internships, practicums, and clinical opportunities • Support for winter field – critical with work with tribal communities, for example • Special accreditation • Integration of Indigenous and local knowledge into all research and disciplines • Interrogation of values and ethical obligations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting conditions for critical thinking and thoughtful dialogue with equitable opportunities
Parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable, accessible, high quality opportunities for their kids
Continuing education programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible learning opportunities that provide both career advancement and personal development
Alumni	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A university degree that is of continuing value in society Continued and impact by their alma matter
Communities and regions in which campuses are located	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local connection to a state-wide education system A hub for economic activity, including regional workforce development (a stable workforce) Ongoing training and development
Alaska Native Corporations and tribes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advancing Indigenous education and preserving culture Workforce development and career opportunities Retention of youth in Alaska Staffing for the Native Corporation
Arts and cultural organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability museums, arts, and cultural organizations Access to student interns Partnerships with the University
Regulatory and oversight bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with regulatory standards
Future students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programs that will adapt to future needs Continued hope for the future
Nonprofit and community service organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to student interns Partnerships with the university Recognition for diversity of programs and offerings
Military	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree options for enlisted, spouses, and officers Partnerships with the university
Government (local, state, and federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workforce development Partnerships with the university
P/K-12 Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research for students and teachers Career pathways Middle college/dual enrollment credit opportunities
Prisoners/ incarcerated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing and learning opportunities – access to education Research learning on issue relevant to the prison system Reductions in recidivism through education
The office of the president and statewide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that students’ interests are advanced in this change process Ensuring that faculty and staff interests are advanced in this change process Not having to go from crisis to crisis on issues of funding and structure Clear constructive recommendations at a time of great challenge Being able to speak with one voice to the legislature, governor, and other key external stakeholders Agility to face future challenges – meeting the current and future needs of Alaska

Notes:

- Among community campuses, some are highly integrated into one of the three university campuses and some are less so.

Phase 4a: Alignment

Points of Alignment:

- A sustainable higher education system and a sustainable society
- Maintaining the reputation and excellence of the university system

Points of Misalignment:

- Understanding of appropriate levels of state support for the university
- Misalignment around the appreciation for the complementary roles of workforce development and liberal education
- The distinct missions of the three universities – at present
- The question of the nature and roles of leadership in programs across the campuses
- A misalignment between a desire to centralize and the diversity across the university (between the statewide approach to the current situation and some of the groups that are in the room for this discussion (even the structure of these discussions may reflect assumptions about an emergency that is no longer exigent))
- The state receives revenues from highly variable sources and there is a misalignment around how to operate in the context of that variation
- A misalignment between the budget issues and the consolidation issues
- A misalignment between the value put in free enterprise by the government and the investment needed in higher education
- A misalignment around the speed of the process – slow versus fast

Concluding note from first session: In Appendix, see Alaska Native Workgroup Recommendations on Guiding Principles and Organizational Chart

On-line question:

- UAA CAS: we would like clarification on the facilitator's other roles in relationship to the president's plan of single accreditation. What was the facilitator's role in relation to the survey for example? What was the facilitator's charge?
 - Responses from the facilitator:
 - A year ago, I contributed to the future visioning process for the University of Alaska
 - Previously the president was aware of my research as an industrial relations scholar, particularly my 1994 co-authored book on *Strategic Negotiations: A theory of Change in Labor-Management Relations*, and my work advancing interest-based bargaining principles through the Program on Negotiation at the Harvard Law School
 - In the present crisis, the president asked if I would help in the development and administration of a stakeholder mapping survey, which is an approach that was developed with support from the National Science Foundation and that has been applied in over two dozen multi-stakeholder situations
 - My current service as the facilitator for this process is more recent and I do not have any specific agenda or mandate other than to ensure a process that is open, inclusive, focused on accurately representing the interests that are involved, and pointed to recommendations that will be an input into Board of Regents decision making in September

Second Session (Anchorage and on-line):

Welcome:

- Thank you to all for being here today.
- The process following this session includes the following:
 - A Board meeting on Sept. 12-13, with the request to prepare a strategic approach as a university
 - There are budget realities, which is part of the process
 - Between now and the Board meeting there will be engagement with faculty governance, staff, students, advisory bodies and others
- This is chance to reimagine the university
 - There is a focus on cuts, but it can be thought about as a change in the level of support from the State of Alaska, which is happening in other states
 - Think of this as being less dependent on state support
 - There are many ways to respond that involve cuts, but it is also possible to respond with new collaborations, expanded revenue, and other options
 - The issue is to diversify our sources of support in creative ways, meeting student needs and growing in new ways
- There are many ways to approach this
 - It is an unexpected opportunity to reimagine the university – not one we sought, but it is still an opportunity
 - We are the lowest college going state – so there is opportunity to position ourselves to do things better
- The Board will need to make decisions in November
- There are opportunities and risks as we go forward
- Appreciation for all of the input

Discussion:

- Discussion on consensus versus other modes of recording levels of agreement
- Discussion on initial data identified, including in particular the earlier plan for the \$135 million cuts
- The October 31/November 1 meeting is the Board of Regents, which is the next-year appropriation meeting, with this additional set of issues
- There was a request for a cost/benefit analysis back in July, and there isn't transparent data on this
- What happens to this document?
 - How will this be framed and introduced?
- There can't be a view that only consensus is good – difference may be beneficial as well
- There is a stereotype of faculty as only resisting change, but there is a view here of people engaging the issues

Phase 4b: Options

(Note: These are options (a product of brainstorming) meant to be thought starters, not formal recommendations. They can be built on, through consultation and planning, as inputs into ways forward that improve collaboration, efficiency, and effectiveness in a resource constrained historical moment, as well as potentially servings as a foundation for the future.)

- What, When, How
 - What
 - The consortium model, a consolidated model, a hybrid
 - When

- Immediate, glide path, or longer with accreditation timing
 - How
 - Reduced state-wide, more reliance on faculty governance, chancellor-led process
- Research more integrated into academic units rather than separate institutes and caners
- Making sure that there is single academic oversight of distance offerings in the system
- A multi-part option as part of the way forward:
 - 1) Slow down the current process,
 - 2) develop big picture view of what is a good/great university (I have strong views on this),
 - 3) decide on some reasonable metrics (if possible) for those qualities,
 - 4) institute a process for developing a set of plans to move forward which can be evaluated against the agreed to metrics,
 - 5) work out the way forward toward the “best” plan.

I can imagine various structures BUT, there is no necessity to destroy a basically good/working structure just for the sake of change. Existing systems can often be improved without changing the basic structure, thereby avoiding the trauma associated with major structural change, the destruction of the good parts and the unexpected impacts of those major structural changes.
- Focusing on process and timeline,
 - Don’t make a decision on the 12th about a single accreditation, but instead adopt a time line for fuller consideration
- Agreement on taking more time
- Look at INDS (interdisciplinary studies degrees) models, working within campuses to see what works locally, to see what the strengths are
- Like the idea of lateral councils
 - Example of an honors program
 - Climate studies is an example of a cross-disciplinary model
 - Option for minors
- Exploration of models like ASU that allows for both disciplines and new interdisciplinary program/degree options
 - Note that this was implemented in a top-down way at ASU and that was problematic
- Consider different modalities of education, within existing programs
- A challenge for a group this large with the breadth of disciplines makes it hard to reach consensus
- Reductions come from within similar departments from the ground up
 - With a facilitated retreat with faculty from all institutions teaching that subject, get to know one another, talk about the students who might be similar or different across institutions and come up with the best ways to collaborate and coordinate
 - Do so in a way to address the fiscal issues
 - We all fear the email that says this is what is happening to your program
- Adopt a more gradual “glide path” for restructuring to allow consideration of a wider range of options and to gather data on the costs and benefits of all proposed restructuring options
 - Importance of data on costs and benefits of options – one UA, back office consolidation, etc.
- Importance of regional sovereignty
 - A mix of in-person, on-line, and hybrid modalities
 - Explore areas of complementary expertise
 - Use this not only to rethink the university, but also STEAM programs and others that can bring in new revenue (with “A” for arts and possibly “H” for SHTEAM)
- Regardless of system accreditation, consolidate similar programs for statewide coordination such as in health, or aquodic ecosystems

- There is an org chart that is out there with research separated into separate entities (slide 30 of the Board of Regents presentation)
 - Have an integrated college of environment
- As part of the process, we should be able to meet in person with the other programs that we are asked to collaborate with. Without knowing our potential partners, it is hard to evaluate the utility of collaboration versus competition.
- Multiple structures that support collaborative, interdisciplinary, student-directed, place-based education and draws from indigenous intellectual authority, and Humanities, Arts, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and outdoor studies.
- Better financial analysis and disaggregated accounting of institutional support spending across the system, including Statewide. (differentiated from instructional spending, academic support, student services and student aid). Student services and student aid took almost 20%, each, in cuts in the period from 2013-2018.
- Collect data from representative samples of students across the system – what they want and what they need – not imposing our view as the only one that matters
 - In a careful good, systematic way – not just the student government leaders, but a true cross-section done in way consistent with scientific practices
 - Example of a survey planned on barriers to student success
- The importance of maintaining traditional disciplines as well as interdisciplinary domains
 - Interdisciplinary minors can serve students to be exposed to a broader cultural context
- Use the current structure to make the budget cuts as needed – take the one university off the table – decouple it from the three-year budget time frame
 - Remove the pressure cooker on the structure discussions
- There is need for a clear sense of the process and where the leadership will come from
 - A view of a bottom-up process, plus a collaborative process through the Chancellors
 - An issue about buy in when change comes from the top
 - A need to use the wisdom in the university so that the strategic plan can be built together
- There is discussion on distance education, which needs academic oversight in disciplinary areas
 - Right now anyone can offer any course anywhere in the system, without oversight, which can result in multiple versions of the same course
- Minimize silos – as UAS issue that may apply more broadly – we have hamstrung ourselves with overlapping units in natural resources, fisheries, etc. all involving environment – a need to link related matters together that sit in different colleges
- It is important to explore that hybrids are – one, two or three universities
 - Some topics may make consolidation work and others may be better separate
 - Some things are working well in each campus and are innovative and don't want to lose that
- Do not attempt to manage distance education (e learning) from a central "mothership". This would be disastrous for many of our programs where distance and local offerings are closely integrated. Distance ed curriculum and offerings should be run from departments just like all other courses.
 - Needs much more dialogue – class sizes have to be different with distance learning
- Structures that allow for faculty governance of curriculum, academic programs and institutional governance
- When we developed the joint fisheries undergraduate program between UAS and UAF, that was a process that actually started before strategic pathways and involved faculty and staff getting together to discuss it. Strategic pathways did speed up the process, but my point is that it took time, quality face-to-face time to work through the pros and cons of various scenarios. That time frame was much longer than we are talking about here and for a much

smaller program. So, we definitely need to slow the process down to make sure major mistakes are not made.

- This may be useful when there are duplicate and “random” offerings of online classes, but when there are integrated departments and programs, this would be disastrous. The problem is lack of coordination.
- Regarding oversight and distance - I don't disagree with the comments, but some programs do have coordination of distance classes.
- We need to get a better sense of the process of how these decisions will be made in a way that takes advantages of the wisdom embodied in the universities and our communities.
- Add the glide path plan to the notes document

Phase 5a: Potential Consensus Recommendations

- **Consensus:** Glide path document
 - Concern with rural campuses that needs more discussion
 - A change in the document to delete the sentence on the \$50 million cut (page 3, second full paragraph) – instead read that the budget proposals are a starting point in meeting the budget short-falls
- **Consensus:** The time frame needs to be slowed down
- **Consensus:** Don't take options off the table
- **Consensus:** When considering options, provide a thorough cost benefits analysis of any restructuring plan before making a decision
 - Statewide information brought forward
- **Consensus:** The importance of getting input in this process from students in a systematic and appropriate way
- **Consensus:** Bringing in the budget information into the discussion – more transparency
- **Consensus:** The Board of Regents greatly increase the public comment period beyond the typical period for a Board of Regents meeting (phone in and in-person)
- **Need more discussion:** Improved integration administratively of research and teaching
- **Consensus:** Decoupling the one-university model from the budget discussions
- **Need more discussion:** Make it easier for students to take courses that are not at their campus – so we can really collaboration across campuses
- **Need more discussion:** To the greatest extent possible preserve as many academic and workforce programs across the state

Phase 5b: Implementation Planning

- **What:**
 - (recommendation)
- **Who:**
 - (listing of stakeholders relevant to the recommendation)
- **When:**
 - (milestones with timing)
- **Where:**
 - (any specific locational considerations)
- **Why:**
 - (the crisp 1 sentence elevator speech on “why change”)
- **How:**
 - (tools, methods, and other mechanisms to be utilized)

Concluding Comments:

- A recommendation to socialize the glide path document more broadly
- The Board does feel a sense of urgency
- Appreciation for the work to give real thought and consideration of real action
- This is a journey to reimagine the university
- These views will be taken into account
- There are both long-term and short term fiscal challenges
- There will be challenges with small and large programs
- There will be issues of services that are and are not centralized
- The engagement of all groups is gratifying
- Use this as springboard to facilitate cross-governance, and cross-departmental conversation
- This is an experiment in technology and appreciate the efforts of all with this

Appendix:

Overall Session Overview:

- **Fairbanks (part I sessions)**
 - Monday, August 19th
 - Health ... Science/Arts/Humanities
 - Tuesday, August 20th
 - Management and Business ... Research ... Engineering
 - Wednesday, August 21st
 - Education ... eLearning ... CTE / Community Campuses
- **Anchorage (part II sessions)**
 - Thursday, August 22nd
 - Health ... Management and Business ... Research ... Engineering
 - Friday, August 23rd
 - Education ... eLearning ... CTE / Community Campuses ...
Science/Arts/Humanities

Parking Lot:

-

Relevant document:

A Summary Explanation of The UA Consortium Model

By Forrest Nabors, Chair, Committee on Governance and Funding
Reform, Faculty Senate, University of Alaska Anchorage, July 29,
2019

The UA Consortium Model is designed to enhance cooperation and cost-savings among UAF, UAA, and UAS, while maintaining each university's status as a separately accredited institution.

The UA Consortium Model

- Promotes costs-savings by sharing functions common to the three universities. These functions may be managed by a team of university-specific administrators or housed at one of the three universities and distributed to the others according to shared service agreements.
- Promotes interoperability of course numbering systems, course time blocks, and course credits and transfers so that students can benefit from access to course offerings and programs offered at other universities in the consortium besides their own.
- Provides avenues for singular colleges or mergers as it makes regional sense (e.g. college of health), not forced mergers according to rigid formula.
- Favors local (chancellor) decision-making, based on firsthand knowledge of student needs, demographic and economic trends.
- Optimizes current accreditation, preventing loss of accreditation and therefore revenues.
- Sustains our existing and significant investments in student recruitment, student success.

- Maintains and continues to foster stronger connections between institutions of higher learning and communities across the state.
- Provides Alaskans with options.
- Leverages existing and significant investments in branding and marketing.
- Promotes higher rates of giving, because donors are more likely to give to their local university than to a university system.
- Promotes alumni support, because alumni are more likely to stay engaged with the institution they know and love, rather than with a university system.

Approach to Cost Savings

- Chancellors work together to surgically reduce costs at each university and to find natural consolidations that generate cost savings without added administration and with the least reduction in enrollment.
- Consolidations are economically driven and a collaborative process among the chancellors at all three universities.
 - Historically, it is such consolidations, rather than consolidations imposed by the president, that have succeeded in saving money and maintaining student access.
 - By contrast, enrollment in education programs across the state is down 30% (268 students) from a year ago this week, in the wake of the top-down elimination of UAA's School of Education and consolidation into UAF's School of Education.
 - President Johnsen proposes a One University Model that would impose the same top-down consolidation upon every college in the state.
- Cost savings are realized from a balanced reduction (e.g. administration, instruction athletics), to minimize the impact on students.
- The chancellors' relationship with their communities, universities, and to each other puts them in a position to collaboratively develop the optimal strategy for budget reductions while maintaining strong universities that serve their individual communities.

Accreditation Considerations

- The Consortium Model can be achieved quickly with minor substantive change and no additional risk to loss of accreditation.
- Currently, all three universities are accredited. UAA and UAS just gained reaffirmation, good for seven years. UAF is in the cycle for reaffirmation.
- The Consortium Model fosters a less disruptive, collective, more thoughtful process for restructuring.

One Size Does Not Fit All

This model recognizes that a one-size fits all approach does not work for our Alaskan communities and is antithetical to promoting efficiency across the system.

- While promoting cooperation across universities, the Consortium Model enables each university to respond to regional needs and differences in their student populations.

- The Consortium Model avoids the creation of statewide “directors of directors,” and needless bureaucratic oversight, a natural byproduct of the One University Model.
- The Consortium Model is flexible, recognizing that in some cases the most efficient and effective way to fulfill certain university functions is by maintaining local control of those functions (University Specific), while in other cases, the best option is for one of the three universities to oversee and distribute a function (Lead University), and in yet other cases it is by sharing a function through a consortium model overseen by cross- functional teams of leaders from each university , sharing responsibility for service quality and student success (Consortium).
- The primary advantage of the Consortium Model is that the same leaders who know their university-specific student populations oversee the shared functions as a team, rather than an additional layer of administration that is disconnected from the communities it is supposed serve.

This approach is illustrated with the following table, categorizing functions within Student Affairs. Some functions are suitably maintained through a consortium, others distributed from a lead university, and others housed at each university.

Suitable for Consortium (communities of practice)	Suitable for Lead University	Suitable for University Specific
1. Financial Aid 2. Admissions 3. Registrar 4. Military & Veteran Student Services 5. UA Foundation scholarship management	1. Career Services 2. Disability Support Services 3. Out-of-state and rural student recruitment	1. Student conduct, crisis & care, Federal mandate compliance (DOS/CSSR) 2. Alaska Native & diversity prog’s. 3. Intercollegiate Athletics 4. Student Health and Counseling 5. Student activities, leadership, governance and organizations 6. Residence Life 7. Intl. student and exchange visitor management (SEVIS) 8. Orientation & first year experience programs 9. Community engagement

Because Student Affairs provides student-facing services, a One University Model could not do without administration of these functions at each major campus location. The One University Model would simply add an additional layer of administration at the Statewide level, when through shared service agreements and cross-functional teams of administrators, already paid for at each institution, services could be delivered collaboratively where it makes economic sense.

Many business services are already shared across the universities, others are in progress, and there are future opportunities for additional savings. The Consortium Model can maximize back-office savings to reduce impacts on instruction and research as effectively as the One-University Model.

Current	In Progress	Future Opportunities
Controller/Financial & Tax Reporting & External Audit	Travel	Payables, Procurement
Internal Audit		Bookstores
Treasury - Endowment & Debt		Risk Management
Risk Management – Insurance & Claims for Property, Liability, Workers Comp	Student Accounting (Fees, common deadlines, etc.)	Common IT Help call center
Human Resources – Compensation, Payroll and Employee Benefits, Union negotiations	Student ID Cards (PolarExpress, Whale Card, Wolf Card)	Campus Security
IT Infrastructure & Security		Further collaborations and decentralization for cost savings and utilization of campus level expertise

Potential Future Savings through the Consortium Model

Currently each university is required (without a service agreement) to use tuition and research dollars to support a large statewide administrative unit with expenditures exceeding \$55M.

With changes in university policy or structure the Consortium Model could realize the following objectives, generating additional cost savings:

- Continued reduction of systemwide costs and additional exploration of cost sharing alternatives through Lead University and Consortium approaches.
- Increase of tuition at UAF (and possibly elsewhere) to match tuition rates at peer institutions
- Increase in donations and separate endowments through regional partnerships as each university is permitted to manage its own foundation account.

Faculty strongly support this approach over the president’s One University Model, recognizing the significant threats his model poses to accreditation, student-facing services, and innovation.

Offered a rare opportunity by the UA Student Regent to share their views before the Board of Regents last week, the chancellors had this to say about the advantages of something like the Consortium Model versus the One University Model:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mn_LaRGdY4E

Additional document that is relevant:

An Assessment of
Single Accreditation versus
Three Separate Accreditations

for the University of Alaska's
Three Universities



UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA

Many Traditions One Alaska

Prepared by

Dana L. Thomas, PhD

P.O. Box 82270
Fairbanks, AK 99708

dlthomas@alaska.edu

July 26, 2016

Recommendation of the UA Restructuring Committee for the Arts, Humanities, and Natural and Social Sciences

August 23, 2019

The August 13 Compact signed by Governor Dunleavy and Board of Regents Chair John Davies provided relief from the worst-case scenario of cuts and gave UA a “glide path” to manage declining state support. In response to the July 30 motion passed by the Board of Regents, President Johnsen charged the Statewide Committee on Arts, Humanities, and Natural and Social Sciences with developing options for structural coverage of those disciplines.

Members of this group recognize the challenges and appreciate the opportunity to manage them in ways that protect our students and accreditation. We agree on three points:

- A. Developing an effective model for structuring the arts, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences, and Alaska Native programs in an environment of reduced state support will require additional time.
- B. The three-year glide path should be utilized to develop and implement a structure that ensures Alaskans throughout the state have access to the highest quality academic programs, and research and creative opportunities, in the arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, and Alaska Native studies. Such a structure will also take into account the need to be efficient, resource conscious, and collaborative while preserving the ability to respond to unique needs in different areas of the state.
- C. A three-year glide path reduces risks associated with hastily made decisions, which could result in loss of accreditation, declines in enrollment, and unnecessary cuts to programs and offerings, among others.

Glide Path Plan Summary

1. AY20: Development

- a. Allow UA Statewide, UAA, UAF, and UAS to manage their portions of the \$25M coordinating among MAUs, Colleges, and Departments.
- b. Use this AY as a planning year to gather data while minimizing disruption to academic programs.
- c. Develop restructuring options for consideration in AY21 and AY22, including
 - i. **Consortium model** of programs in arts, humanities, natural and social sciences and Alaska Native programs
 - ii. **Single-accreditation** that merges comparable programs in arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, and Alaska Native studies.
 - iii. **Proof-of-concept approach** where programs that favor consolidation can do so first and can be evaluated for their success.
 - iv. **Other options**

2. AY21: Evaluation

- a. Allow UA Statewide, UAA, UAF, and UAS to manage their portion of the \$25M cuts coordinating among MAUs, Colleges, and Departments.
- b. Evaluate restructuring options based on
 - i. internal data and evidence
 - ii. external data and evidence such as experiences in other states, NWCCU, specialized accreditors, etc.

3. AY22: Implementation

Rationale for Glide Path Plan

The University of Alaska is no longer facing a cut of \$135M. Still, we must address the prospect of a \$25M reduction in state funds this year with the prospect of an additional \$45M reduction in funds the following two years. A \$70M cut over three years necessitates the serious consideration of structural changes to the university system across the state.

Given the gravity of the changes that must be considered, and the potential for harm, we should allow time for evidence-based decision making and a well-informed and considered approach to all options.

Hasty decisions could result in:

- Loss of accreditation for individual programs or for the university
- Negative impacts to students if programs are eliminated or consolidated
- Significant declines in enrollment
- Loss of highly qualified faculty and staff
- Unnecessary cuts to programs and offerings
- Loss of trust and relevance with our local communities and environments¹

Because the \$70M reduction will be spread out over three years, we have time to make structural changes in a thoughtful, well-informed way. We have been given a “glide path;” we should use it.

The Board of Regents should rescind the portion of their July 30, 2019 motion directing the president to prepare a strategic approach to combining academic colleges and schools across the three MAUs (Section 2) and to pursue single accreditation of the University of Alaska (Section 3).

In order to make an evidence-based decision about university structure, the single accreditation plan needs to be subject to a process of development and evaluation that involves a comparison with alternative models of restructuring. This will ensure the greatest benefits to students across Alaska while being cognizant of financial realities.

Notably, the recent attempt at a merger of public two-year colleges in the State of Connecticut provides an important warning. Even after considerable cost-benefit analysis and planning, the application for accreditation for this complex merger of multiple institutions was rejected by the accrediting commission because the plan failed to “ensure minimal disruption to students” and because the plans for implementation of the changes were not sufficiently “realistic.”²

The proposed “New UA” merger of all of Alaska’s public universities is unprecedented in its scope, especially considering the distances separating campuses and the lack of alternative options in higher education in the state. *In light of these unique challenges, it is imperative that sufficient time be allocated to identify a restructuring option that best serves Alaskan students and communities and that addresses the financial situation in a realistic way.*

¹ Thomas, D. (2016). *An Assessment of Single Accreditation versus Three Separate Accreditations for the University of Alaska’s Three Universities*. (pp. 5–7). Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska.

² Angel, D. P. (2018). *New England Association of Schools & Colleges’ Commission on Institutions of Higher Education response to the proposed consolidation of 12 separately-accredited community colleges by the Connecticut State College and University System*.

This year (AY20) and the following two years (AY 21 and 22), with approval from the Board of Regents, local administration should make cuts at each administrative unit to meet the budget shortfall while maintaining separate institutional accreditations.

In July, the chancellors and president put forward budgets for a collective \$135M in across the board cuts to their respective units. These budget proposals can serve as the starting point for developing a plan with faculty and staff governance to meet the \$25M shortfall this year as well as the reductions anticipated in the next two years. Collectively, the budget proposals submitted to the board in July cut \$50M in administration. This suggests that between the three universities and the statewide administration, cuts could be sustained during FY20 that for the most part do not directly impact academic programs. This approach is the most prudent option to provide minimal disruption to students.

During AY20, each administrative unit, in collaboration with its faculty, staff, and students, should develop a budget plan to respond to these cuts during the next three years. The first year (FY20) should avoid cuts to academic programs. The second (FY21) and third year (FY22) should seek to avoid disrupting students' academic programs as much as possible through the implementation of mutually advantageous collaborations, partnerships, and consolidations of programs across the system. Such an approach may emphasize the great advantages of maintaining separate university accreditations.

Should the Board of Regents eventually decide in favor of a plan of single accreditation, consolidations that are implemented by the separate MAUs will make the transition to a single university less disruptive to students. Consolidations also will pose less of a threat to university accreditation.

With the understanding that a \$70M cut will require some form of change in institutional structure, the Board of Regents should initiate a process for the development and evaluation of restructuring plans.

We recommend that during the AY20, alternative restructuring plans are developed, including a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of each alternative and a detailed account of how each model satisfies common criteria for evaluating each alternative.

We recommend that the foundational criteria for evaluating these plans should be student access and excellence in teaching, research, and public service. The plans developed presumably would include the "New UA" single accreditation plan and the three-university consortium model but other plans may be developed and evaluated during this time.

Plans originating from academic programs expressing mutual desire for restructuring should be encouraged, incentivized and given preference.

During AY21, a process of evaluation of these alternative plans should take place, utilizing the criteria developed during AY20. This process of evaluation should end with a decision by the board regarding the implementation of one of these plans. To best protect the integrity of the UA system, accreditation review at UAF should proceed without including substantive change for consolidation to a singly accredited institution. Note the outcome of the Connecticut single accreditation consolidation above: If UA attempts are similarly rejected, UAF could lose its accreditation.

During AY22, the implementation of the selected plan may begin. If this involves a move towards single accreditation it is during this year that applications for the substantive change process might begin.

Endorsements By Committee Members

Joel M. Potter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
University of Alaska Anchorage

Khrys Duddleston, Ph.D
Professor and Director of Biological Sciences
University of Alaska Anchorage

John Petraitis, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Interim Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Alaska Anchorage

David Newman
Professor of Physics
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Javier Fochesatto
Professor of Atmospheric Sciences
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Steven Johnson, Director
Seawolf Debate Program
University of Alaska Anchorage

Ellen D. S. Lopez, PhD, MPH
Associate Professor
Chair, Psychology and Philosophy
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Mary Beth Leigh
Professor of Microbiology
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Chad R. Farrell
Professor of Sociology
University of Alaska Anchorage

Steven Godfrey
Professor of Art
University of Alaska Anchorage

Leah Wrenn Berman
Professor of Mathematics
Chair, Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Elizabeth J. Dennison
Professor of History

Associate Dean of Fine Arts and Humanities
University of Alaska Anchorage

Simon A. Kattenhorn, Ph.D.
Director and Professor of Geological Sciences
University of Alaska Anchorage

Kevin Krein
Professor of Philosophy
University of Alaska Southeast

Andrea Dewees, PhD
Associate Professor of Spanish
University of Alaska Southeast

Claudia Lampman, PhD
Professor of Psychology
Vice Provost for Student Success
University of Alaska Anchorage

David H. Noon
Professor of History
University of Alaska Southeast

Grant Cochran
Professor of Music
Chair, Department of Music
University of Alaska Anchorage

Carrie Baker
Professor of Film & Performing Arts
Chair, Department of Theatre & Film
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Chanda L. Meek, PhD
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
University of Alaska Fairbanks

John Radzilowski
Professor of History
University of Alaska Southeast

Kinchel C Doerner, PhD
Dean, College of Natural Science and Mathematics
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Scott Downing
Associate Professor of English
University of Alaska Anchorage
Kenai Peninsula College

John Moore
Vice-Chair UA Staff Alliance
Co-President UAA Staff Council

Matthew Pawlus, PhD
Assistant Professor of Science
University of Alaska Southeast

Diane Wagner
Chair, Biology and Wildlife Department
University of Alaska Fairbanks

LaNora Tolman
Executive Officer
College of Liberal Arts
University of Alaska Fairbanks

John Heaton
Associate Dean
College of Liberal Arts
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Karsten Hueffer
Associate Dean
College of Natural Science and Mathematics
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Maria Williams
Professor
Alaska Native Studies and Music
University of Alaska Anchorage

Lora Vess, PhD

Associate Professor
Chair, Social Sciences
University of Alaska Southeast

Alexander Hirsch
Director, Honors Program
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, and Arctic and Northern Studies
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Todd Sherman
Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Professor of Art
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Chris Coffman
Professor of English
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Cheryl Siemers
Assistant Director for Academic Affairs
Professor of English
Kenai Peninsula College