University of Alaska Academic Structure Change Management

Focus: Management and Business

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 that 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:
- Thank you all for joining in this dialogue on engineering in the University of Alaska
- This is the first of two meetings
- This session is in response to the board's directive to look at the consolidation of the system and consideration for single accreditation
- Even though the new compact is better than things were, there are still unprecedented budget cuts of over $20 million a year for three years
- This is chance to look at ways to be collaborative across the system and surface ideas on how to move forward
- Think of this as the beginning of ways to move forward
- The goal is to help advise the board

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 supports the session; 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.

Change Management Model:
Phase 1: Hopes & Fears (30 min.)
Phase 2: Vision & Data (30 min.)
Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests (30 min.)
Phase 4: Alignment & Options (30 min. + Session 2)
Phase 5: Recommendations & Implementation (Session 2)

Phase 1a: Hopes
- We can find new ways to work together
- Increased organizational clarity – so we will all know who is doing what regarding student's needs
- More collaboration among the schools, enabling more flexibility by students taking courses from different locations in Alaska and even the lower 48
- Our student needs are still met
- Unique programs that exist on all campuses continue to be unique
- With the opportunity that this is presenting us that we grab ahold of it and think outside the box
- Strengthening the pipeline from K-12 into higher education
- Not having students coming from 2 year programs having to do things over once in a four year
- Opportunity for broader faculty and course options for instruction

Phase 1b: Fears
- This process will include too much transition work in a short amount of time and will distract us from the work with the students
  - A fear on how to do this in a timely manner
- A weakening of some very strong programs, such as the accounting program
- Not having a cookie cutter approach to programs
- We will lose access to place-based learning during the consolidation
- This will compromise donations
- This will constrain innovation
- Losing the opportunity to reach unique populations and local business needs in each location
- In the process we lose sight of student demand and overall efficiency
  - There is strong student demand for business education
- A concern with impact on specialize accreditation

Phase 2a: Elements of a Future Success Vision – 2025
- We have strong schools in each location and can leverage what we are doing well by 2025
- A student that starts in a certificate program ends up in an MBA program in six years – easily and seamlessly
- Having a strong university that encourages residents to take part in higher education – students now in high school may be discouraged by what is happening now and the vision is for residents to want to stay in state for higher education
- Sharing faculty resources across campuses
- Retaining AACSB accreditation
- A fully integrated, accredited set of programs:

- o Cultural, social, economic, and environmental sustainability
- o Note that there are 200+ Alaska Native Corporations – unique in the world
- o Serving the needs of rural communities (in addition to the Alaska Native Corporations)
- The current state-wide on-line program is already state-wide – it is now growing and will continue to grow by 2025
  - o Providing long-term economic benefits to Alaska society
  - o Professional in various towns have remote access – face to face and on-line, with advanced e-learning
  - o Meeting non-traditional student needs
  - o Serving the needs of the Alaska Native Corporations
  - o From regional programing to state-wide
- Able to retain and recruit high-quality faculty
  - o Overcoming the current risk of losing faculty
- A clear, shared understanding of what success looks like
- A strong presence for delivery to individuals who are place bound – strengthening their role in society and their communities
- Increased international presence in Alaska – students from around the world
  - o An opportunity at a time of declining enrollments
- Enhanced experiences and outcomes for students
- The future school of management is a space for creative thinking and entrepreneurship

Phase 2b: Relevant and Available Data
- Initial data sent in by UAF
  - o Degrees
  - o Majors
  - o Minors
  - o Enrollment trends
  - o FTE faculty and staff
  - o Revenue and expenses
- Question on parallel data from other units
- Request to ensure that data is vetted by IR
- Discussion on the value of common data set
- Business data is also helpful in comparison to other programs
- There is also qualitative data that needs to be taken into account
- A concern that data is not weaponized
- There is not agreement at present on how the data relates across campuses
- Institutional research data is also relevant
- Data on workforce demand is especially relevant
- Question on the data time frame (last five years?)
- Example of UAS consolidation as a success story with are more flexible architecture
- The data looks good across all the business and management programs
- Use central sources for data

Potential option:
- o Forming a small working group on data that will identify data that is relevant and available for ongoing dialogue among the programs
  - o People to be appointed by the relevant deans
  - o Ask statewide to pull data from the dashboard
  - o Include UAF technical and applied programs
  - o Ensure that the full breadth of programs, including community campuses are included

Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests

Stakeholders	Interests
All stakeholders (shared interests)	
Current undergraduate students	• Increased opportunities in Alaska, as good or better than what they would have by leaving the state • Seamless learning experience regardless of location • Support for advising, financial aid, placement, etc.
Current high school students	• Increased opportunities in Alaska, as good or better than what they would have by leaving the state • Confidence that there will not be future crises facing higher education
Current graduate students	• Programs that are accessible, affordable and sustainable in the Alaska job market
Faculty in business and management	• Stability and professional satisfaction • An appropriate balance among teaching, research, and service
Staff in business and management	• Stability and professional satisfaction • Continued access to current and future opportunities
Employers and industry	• Participation in advisory roles • Internships • Employees with skills • Interests of high profile global organizations with respect to Olympic movement
Alaska Native Corporations	• Relevant social, economic and business research • Specialized degree programs and courses
Rural communities	• Access, opportunities, support for Alaska Native
Board of Regents	• Constructive options to address short-term financial pressures and long-term value to the State of Alaska • Accreditation
Alumni	• Maintaining long-term relations • Links to US Olympic committee maintained
Donors	• Maintaining long-term relations • Links to US Olympic committee maintained
Non-traditional students	• Flexibility to match work/life schedules
Non-profit organizations	• Employees with skills • Attention to non-commercial applications in instruction
Military	• Flexibility to match work/life schedules
Community campus partners and articulation agreements	• Well-defined articulation agreements enabling seamless student progress
Local and state government	• Responsible stewardship of public funds • Advancing economic development

Welcome:
- There was a great deal of work at the last meeting, with ongoing dialogue
- See this as the beginning of a conversation, leading up the September meeting with the Board and beyond.

Phase 4a: Alignment

Points of Alignment:
- A common commitment to serving local communities
- UAF and UAA are both accredited, with service to students and external partners in regions and on-line
- Appreciation for the diverse populations served
- Flexibility is required by stakeholders – in delivery and other dimensions
- There is alignment around student support, including student competitions, student involvement in local communities (especially small businesses)
- Alignment around the importance of student placement
- Alignment around the importance of serving military students
- Agreement on not wanting to go backwards and instead achieve more

Points of Misalignment:
- There are differences across regions – for example locations are isolated and students are scattered, with many non-traditional students as well as traditional students
- Delivery methods vary – differences are not bad, but they are different and need to be taken into account
    - There is a mix of MPA programs that are face to face and on-line
- There is variation on MPA programs focused more on administration versus public policy in different locations – not a conflict, but differences that could be integrated and respond to growing market need (Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau)
    - There could be more MPA programming in Juneau linked to the state capital, with more on public policy
- Understanding how it is that we could take the two (actually three) units, each highly efficient and be more efficient
    - Both stand out on teaching efficiency, research output, etc.
- Flexibility is defined differently by different stakeholders
- Stakeholders focus on quality and access that is a trade off against cost
- Currently each unit has its own budget control and a worry that consolidation would lead to delays in taking advantage of regional opportunities
- A potential misalignment around students as students and as future employees
- A misalignment on failing to fully serve international students as much as we should – we could do better across the system

Discussion of Charts on Fields and Disciplines:
- There is a great deal of symmetry across campuses
    - Links to research institutes
    - Links to engineering
    - Links to alumni
- Our mindsets, advising, etc. is consistent across fields and disciplines
- There is a strong innovating green line connecting to eLearning
    - Not just throwing up powerpoint, but a mix of asynchronous, synchronous, and blended – real flexibility

5

- It is hard to see what other campuses are doing – the links are across fields and disciplines within our campus
- As a system we see the links with alumni as an area that needs more focus and improvement
- There are strong connections with Arts and Sciences and Humanities
- Distance business and MPA results in alumni in locations around the state
    - Points to the need to develop networks of professionals
- A need to connect with programs in other states and countries
- There is a strong way to combine business with other subjects – dual majors, dual degrees, minors, etc.
- This is a way to think about visioning for what might be new – we added industry and K-12 as bubbles on the chart
- eLearing is a key connection that jumped out
- Some red (needs work) with Arts and Sciences, but could have more for non-business majors – more of a universal minor relevant to many

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.)

- Limited consolidation – retaining unique programs
- Focus on what is working well – the on-line state-wide MPA program as an example, with potential for increased alignment with Anchorage
    - Assess the situation on a program by program basis
- If there is a distance delivered business minor, it should be compatible with other degrees, particularly on-line degrees
- Based on student enrollment, number of majors, credit hour delivery, and program offerings, I recommend that all Bachelors and Graduate face-to-fact programs in Business, Public Policy, and Public Administration be delivered in Anchorage,
    - Degree curriculum should be uniform and coordinated for all business, public policy, and public administration programs across the state
    - Required for ACCSB accreditation for business programs in one school
- Recommend taking an inventory of existing courses to know what the different MAs offer across campuses
    - There are different strengths, but we need to know what is in place now
- There is not the view that one college of business can work, but consider a UA global college like the Arizona State Model, but with local business connections through local programs
- The alternative of a "collaborative model" where we can each focus on serving our respective regions (with the patience to not have turf wars), with some alignment of courses, and revenue sharing agreements so we can each offer classes that help others and work together on accreditation
- The option of three campuses, each offering face to face, with the deans and department chairs coordinating, with more on-line offerings that are shared, and help for programs that need help
    - Don't build down programs that are generating revenue
    - Do address duplication
- One model is that each school has its own curriculum committee and a combined committee for alignment across the state (further aligned across domains beyond management and business)

6

- o Some of that is happening informally, but overhead can get in the way
- o Informally students can transfer across
- o Important to preserve nimbleness in new programing
- o Issues of cost are key remove disincentives to coordinate
- We are not starting from scratch and there are existing brands
- It should be considered having a core curriculum across all campuses
  - o Business, MPP, MPA
- If we want to attract students from out of state and internationally, focus on sustainability
  - o Turn the bug into a feature
  - o It is in the state constitution
- A common issues is placement of students in internships, where we can help each other
- One of the concepts to consider is the organizational theory of an agile structure – a holacracy – that response to needs. This is an emerging topic in business education

Phase 5a: Potential Consensus Recommendations
- *Needs further discussion:* Explore a common core curriculum
  - o Requires alignment with accreditors
  - o Requires consideration of vulnerable populations
  - o There may be a more flexible core with ease of transfer
  - o Find ways to also value diversity
- *Consensus:* An inventory of all offerings across the three campuses and exploration of how it is being offered and to whom
  - o On line and face to face
  - o Rural versus urban
  - o Delivery modes
  - o Also look at the AAS degrees
  - o Identifying redundancies, opportunities for efficiency and options for creativity

Note: Comment that there is much more agreement than disagreement across the campuses.

Phase 5b: Implementation Planning Template
- **What:**
  - o (recommendation)
- **Who:**
  - o (listing of stakeholders relevant to the recommendation)
- **When:**
  - o (milestones with timing)
- **Where:**
  - o (any specific locational considerations)
- **Why:**
  - o (the crisp 1 sentence elevator speech on "why change")
- **How:**
  - o (tools, methods, and other mechanisms to be utilized)

Concluding Comments:
- There are important issues surfaced here
- This is the beginning of dialogue – in this case management and business programs
- The last agreement on a review of courses across the system is a key next step'
- There will be additional engagement of faculty, staff, students, and others going forward
- There will not be a specific recommendation to the Board, but rather a process of review that will surface redundancies and opportunities for collaboration

- Structure and budget can't be fully separated
  - The administrative foot print has come up and it involve three accredited universities each with duplicative administrative structures required by accreditation
  - The same is true at the program level
- There is a need to move forward with program review in the face of the current budget, as well as shared services
- This is a unique opportunity – few universities get to reimagine themselves in createive ways
  - There are risks in this process, so input is key to mitigate the risks
  - The dialogue will continue and broaden in order to inform the Board in September and provide a framework moving forward

Appendix:

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