Academic Council Charter
Provosts’ Draft

I. Membership and Chair
1. Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, UA Statewide (Chair)
2. Provost, UAF
3. Provost, UAA
4. Provost, UAS
5. Chair, Community Campus Directors Council
6. Vice Chancellor for Research, UAF
7. Associate Vice President, Workforce, UA Statewide
8. Dean, College of Health, UAA
9. UAA Faculty Senate President
10. UAF Faculty Senate President
11. UAS Faculty Senate President

II. Charter Initial Draft
• Mission – To foster University of Alaska delivery of high-quality, cost-effective academic programs that are readily accessible to students in Alaska and beyond, through appropriate policies and academic administrative procedures, collaboration, and review of academic program actions including new program approval, program reduction, and program discontinuation.
• Scope – Degree, undergraduate certificate programs requiring 30 or more credits, and graduate and post-baccalaureate certificate programs that are delivered by UAA, UAF, and UAS, either singly or in collaboration.
• According to University Regulation 10.02.020 for the Statewide Academic Council, the Academic Council serves to assist the VPASA in performing responsibilities listed in Board of Regents Policy P02.02.017.
• Goals:
  o Work with Statewide governance, and through the Provosts with University faculty governance, to implement existing and new Board of Regents’ policies, such as alignment of General Education Requirements and initial course placement for entering students.
  o Through the President, advise the Board on policy changes and other actions to improve academic program quality, increase student access, increase university revenue, or reduce costs.
  o Monitor Alaska’s workforce needs and coordinate University program collaboration, development, or expansion to meet those needs.
  o Develop and implement joint strategies, complementary to University strategies, to meet established enrollment goals.
  o Respond to assignments of the UA Board of Regents and the UA President.
authority and decision process:

1. The AC recommends actions to the President or Board of Regents, depending on the level of decision, through the VPASA. The AC makes recommendations in the following categories:
   o Consensus of the VPASA and AC. All agree on the recommendation as presented.
   o Majority of the AC, with concurrence of the VPASA. In this case, the source(s) and nature of the dissenting views are noted in the recommendation.

2. For decisions that do not require Board or President approval, implementation requires agreement of all AC members.
   o If the action involves only academic affairs, the Provosts will work with Faculty Governance and community campus administration, as required, to implement the decision.
   o If the action involves other functional areas, such as student services or administrative services, the proposed action will be reported to the Summit Team and introduced at other councils, as appropriate.

reporting – To the President, University of Alaska

plan for interaction with other councils:
   o The Chair (VPASA) also chairs the Research Council, and the UAF Provost and UAF Vice Chancellor for research are members of the Research Council. This will support communication and coordination in areas of mutual interest, including graduate programs and engagement of undergraduate students in research.
   o The three provosts, the UAF VCR, and the VPASA are members of the new Summit Team, and will regularly meet with members of other Councils and will report major SAC activities to them.
   o The e-Learning Council (and Community Campus Council???) report to SAC

communication plan – Report to Summit Team according to the established schedule. Report to the Board of Regents annually on goals achieved and progress on remaining goals.

meeting schedule – Monthly
Academic Council Update
For 9/21/17 Summit Team Meeting

The Academic Council (AC) has met twice since receiving the June 2017 memo from President Johnsen establishing the new councils. The first meeting on July 21, was to ‘sunset’ the Statewide Academic Council (SAC). The second meeting, the first of the AC, was held on August 18, 2017.

- The AC has drafted a charter (submitted to the President on 091217).
- The AC has identified members of the eLearning subgroup that will report through the AC (email from S. Oba on 090517). The first meeting is being scheduled.
- The AC started a draft charter for the eLearning subgroup.
- The AC is the hiring committee for the VPASA. The group has met once with Keli Hite McGee, chair of the search committee. The review of applicants has begun. The second meeting of the group will occur the week of 091817.
- The AC has proposed changes to University Regulations where Statewide Academic Council is referenced to update the council name to the Academic Council.
- The AC received updates from Strategic Pathways areas of SW Health program planning and Community Campuses.
- New program additions and discontinuations (submitted to the ASA committee on 090717)
  a. UAA
     i. Accelerated Master’s in Mechanical Engineering (addition)
     ii. Graduate Certificate and Master’s of Education in Counselor Education (discontinuation)
  b. UAF
     i. Resilience and Adaptation Program, Graduate Certificate (addition)
     ii. Arctic Engineering MS (discontinuation)
     iii. Engineering Management MS (discontinuation)
     iv. Science Management MS (discontinuation)
     v. Environmental Engineering MS (discontinuation)
     vi. Mineral Preparation Engineering MS (discontinuation)
     vii. Software Engineering MS (discontinuation)
  c. UAS – Associate of Business (discontinuation)
- Proposals for program suspension of admissions – UAS AAS Law Enforcement (temporary administrative).
- Program Review and Accreditation Reports – All three universities submitted reports for September ASA/BOR meetings.
- The AC is working on draft language for the concurrent enrollment regulation.
- Next AC meeting: 092617
A. Mission

- To advise the president and other university officers on matters within the council’s scope.
- To provide strategic leadership and vision.
- To collaborate system-wide.
- Fulfill responsibilities with an emphasis on optimizing resources for the achievement of the university’s mission.
- To prioritize and resource finance and administrative support services and projects, e.g. automation, compliance.
- As directed by President, report to Summit Team.

B. Scope

Financial, administrative, risk, facilities, and land matters.

C. Reporting to Summit Team

- Status and impact of major finance, administrative, facilities and lands projects
- Proposed annual risk matrix
- Proposed annual audit plan
- Key indicators/metrics

D. Members

Chief Finance Officer – Myron Dosch (Chair)
VP University Relations – Michelle Rizk
VC Admin Services, UAA – Patrick Shier
VC Admin Services, UAF – Kari Burrell
VC Admin Services, UAS – Michael Ciri
Director Facilities/Land – Christine Klein
Chief Audit Executive – Nikki Pittman
Chief Procurement Officer – John Hebard
Chief Human Resources Officer – Keli McGee
Chief Risk Officer – Timothy Edwards
E. Meeting Schedule

Monthly, about one week prior to the Summit Team meeting

F. Goals (these are not static, and will need to be updated from time to time)

Short term:
1. Strategic Pathways – Procurement (report progress to President by Sept 1, 2017)
2. Strategic Pathways – Research Administration (develop a plan for President by October)
3. Strategic Investment (FY18) – Process Automation (make decisions in August or before)

G. Interaction with Other Councils

- Facilities Council is a sub-council to the Business Council. Director of SW Lands to share status of FC efforts.
- Human Resources Council is a separate council; CHRO will serve as linkage between HRC and Business Council sharing status of HRC efforts.
- IT Council is a separate council. Several Business Council members also on IT Council; CFO to share status of IT Council efforts.
- Emergency Management Council and Environmental Health & Safety Council are separate councils with the Chief Risk Officer as liaison to Business Council
- Meet with other councils on an as-needed basis

H. Communication Plan

- President and Board of Regents – Business Council Chair to serve as spokesperson
- Summit Team – Written updates (agendas, decision proposals) provided in advance of each monthly meeting; verbal updates provided at the meeting if requested.
- Other system councils – Share monthly meeting agendas with the other council chairs
- Statewide and university units – Draft final decision memos for Summit Team; decision memos would propose roll-out plans to include communication and training; decisions issued by President or other appropriate university officer(s).
September 8, 2017

TO: Jim Johnsen, UA President

FROM: Myron Dosch, Chief Finance Officer

RE: Business Council Report

The Business Council met twice since inception on July 1, 2017, and will continue to meet monthly, approximately one week before the Summit Team. As further described herein, several important initiatives are well underway.

Charter
A proposed charter is attached for review.

Strategic Pathways – Procurement
John Hebard, Chief Procurement Officer, is leading the implementation effort. A service level agreement between UAF and Statewide for the procurement function has been completed. Goals and initiatives to achieve savings via bulk purchases, process improvement/automation and policy and procedure standardization have been identified. Implementation and effort to achieve these goals will be on-going in FY18 and FY19.

Strategic Pathways – Research Administration
Rosemary Madnick, UAF Executive Director of Grants and Contracts, is leading the planning and implementation effort. To date, an inventory assessment tool identifying the various roles and responsibilities in the grants and contracts area is being completed by the universities. The tool will help organize the various roles of Grants and Contracts (G&C), with the aim of G&C leadership at UAF with service centers at UAA and UAS. In addition, the tool will help analyze those functions most viable for improvement, streamlining and/or automation across the UA System. The Business Council will continue to cross-communicate with the Research Council as planning develops. A full plan will be developed for the President in October.

Process Improvement and Automation
The President and Regents authorized $1.1m in FY18 for process improvement and automation. The CFO sent an internal RFP to the functional areas of Student, HR, Finance, IT and Institutional Research to solicit automation project proposals. A number
of proposals were received, and the Business Council deliberated on all proposals. The Business Council approved nine projects in HR, Finance and Administration areas and requested additional information on several others. In total, $645,000 was allocated. The remaining $455,000 will be allocated as proposals are received. At this time, it would be helpful to receive automation or improvement proposals for student-facing technologies, so as to positively impact enrollment, retention and completion.

A summary of the approved projects to date:

HR – Open Enrollment Automation
HR – OnBase Integration (vendor forms)
HR – Online I-9 and Employee Paperwork
HR – Family Medical Leave (FML) Process Improvement
HR – Retirement files to SPARK format
Admin – Consulting support for Travel Project implementation
Admin – UA Procurement Records to OnBase
Admin – OnBase Integration for e-workflows
Finance – Replace and update property scanners and system

It is important to note that within the broad scope of the Finance and Administration, there are several very large automation or compliance projects underway that do not explicitly flow from Strategic Pathways or the $1.1 million Automation pool. These projects that arise in the normal course of operations include: travel booking tool and expense management, conversion to Banner 9, accounts receivable conversion for IRS Form 1098-T, and JV workflow. They will consume a significant amount of staff time over the next one to two years.
University of Alaska Community Campus Directors Council (CCDC)

Represented by leaders of campuses and colleges at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), University of Alaska Southeast (UAS), and University of Alaska Workforce Programs.

CCDC Charter

Mission
To serve as an informational and advisory group to the president and Summit Team on statewide issues of common importance to the community campuses and CTCs across the University of Alaska.

Scope
Create opportunities, address the challenges, and better serve the citizens of Alaska by providing access to education and training available through the University of Alaska system.

Reporting
The Council Chair, in collaboration with a Council member designee, shall be responsible for establishing meeting agendas. The agenda, with any relevant materials, shall be emailed to Council members at least seven-days in advance of the meeting. The Council member designee shall keep the Minutes for all meetings. The Council Chair shall review the Minutes, and the Council members shall approve the Minutes at the following meeting. The Council Chair shall submit reports to the UA Summit Team monthly.

Chair & Vice Chair
The President of the University shall designate the Council Chair. The Chair’s responsibilities are to ensure the Council has an approved charter; ensure system-wide priorities are implemented in a collaborative and coordinated manner; lead communication with the Summit Team; and escalate issues requiring consideration by the Executive Team and the President. The CCDC vice chair will be the CCDC representative to the Academic Council (approved by the President June 28, 2017). The Chair of each system-wide governance group may serve on any council. Additional council members may be added by request of the Council Chair with approval of the President.
Members
The CCDC is comprised of the 15 community campus directors, Community and Technical College (CTC) deans, UAS Dean of Career Education, and UA Statewide Associate Vice President of Workforce Programs. A majority of the Council members, present and voting, shall constitute a quorum.

Meeting Schedule
The CCDC shall convene by telephone or video conference (TBD) at 9:00 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month beginning September 13, 2017 except for months the CCDC convenes in-person. The teleconference phone number or video conference information shall be disseminated by email to the Council one-week before each meeting. The CCDC shall convene in-person meetings in Anchorage twice each academic year in November and March. If the Council chooses, the location of the in-person meeting may change. Council members unable to attend may participate by telephone or video conference.

Goals
1. Represent University of Alaska community campuses and provide assessments and recommendations to the president and chancellors (Regents Policy P02.04.500 (A).
2. Foster improved understanding of the roles (Regents Policy P10.02.050) and mission (Regents Regulation R10.02.050) for community campuses and CTCs across the UA System.
3. Promote increased collaboration across community campuses and CTCs and with the three universities.
4. Expand collaboration with secondary and post-secondary organizations and regional partners.
5. Continue to explore ways to increase campus productivity and cost effectiveness.

Plan for Interaction with Other Councils
Other UA Councils are included in the Communication Plan contained within this charter. CCDC shall interact with other UA councils through information sharing on a monthly basis (e.g. dissemination of CCDC report to the Summit Team). Other UA Councils’ reports will be shared by the CCDC chair with the CCDC members. Additional interaction with the other councils will be dependent on those action items being worked by the CCDC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>CCDC</th>
<th>Summit Team</th>
<th>Other UA Councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Meetings</td>
<td>Start date 9-13-2017</td>
<td>Teleconference/videoconference</td>
<td>Council Chair</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person meetings</td>
<td>November and March</td>
<td>In-Person in Anchorage</td>
<td>Council Member coordinates</td>
<td>CCDC President Selected Statewide reps Chancellors Provosts VCs of Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Document sent by email to UA president</td>
<td>Council Chair and member designee</td>
<td>Review Approve</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by CCDC Aug. 18, 2017.
University of Alaska Community Campus Directors Council (CCDC)
Represented by leaders of campuses and colleges at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), University of Alaska Southeast (UAS), and University of Alaska Workforce Programs.

UAF Community & Technical College
UAF Kuskokwim Campus
UAS Career Education
UAA Matanuska Susitna College
UAA KPC Kenai River Campus

UAF Northwest Campus
UAF Interior Alaska Campus
UAS Ketchikan Campus
UAA Prince William Sound College
UAA KPC Kachemak Bay Campus

UAF Bristol Bay Campus
UAF Chukchi Campus
UAS Sitka Campus
UAA Kodiak College
University of Alaska Workforce Programs

Council Update

Work Done June 28-August 31
• More than 100 email exchanges and numerous phone calls were conducted between the 15 members.

• Drafts and redrafts were worked on during this period and include: Charter, Strategic Pathways Report, and “University Policies for Respective Community Campuses, CTCs & UAS Career Education.”

• Chair Gary J. Turner and vice chair, Priscilla Schulte (CCDC representative to Academic Council) had two phone calls about Academic Council meetings, and will continue to meet telephonically at least monthly after these meetings.

• The schedule of future audioconference and face-to-face meetings is specified in the charter.

• The work products have been submitted to the president.

Future Meetings Through November
• Sept. 13 audioconference
• Oct. 9 audioconference
• Nov. 8-9 F2F meeting in Anchorage
University of Alaska Community Campus Directors Council (CCDC)

Represented by leaders of campuses and colleges at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), University of Alaska Southeast (UAS), and University of Alaska Workforce Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAF Community &amp; Technical College</th>
<th>UAF Interior Alaska Campus</th>
<th>UAF Bristol Bay Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAF Kuskokwim Campus</td>
<td>UAS Ketchikan Campus</td>
<td>UAF Chukchi Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS Career Education</td>
<td>UAA Prince William Sound College</td>
<td>UAS Sitka Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAA Matanuska Susitna College</td>
<td>UAA KPC Kachemak Bay Campus</td>
<td>UAA Kodiak College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAA KPC Kenai River Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Alaska Workforce Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Pathways Directions (June 2017)

CCDC Input

The three Strategic Pathways directions below were included in the President’s Jun. 26, 2017 memo, “Expansion of Summit Team, Reorganization of System-wide Councils, and Establishment of Executive Council.” The CCDC comments to Direction #1 are listed below. Our recommendations for what are now four “Decisions/Recommendations” are listed below each of those sections.

1. Increase integration with main university campus and collaboration across community campuses. Update to be prepared by Community Campus Council, presented to the Academic Council in September.

Comment: This recommendation appears to merge two options from the Jan. 18, 2017 Community Campuses Team Report submitted to President Johnsen in response to Phase 2 of the Strategic Pathways initiative: 3) Increased Integration with Regional Universities and 6) Enhanced Collaboration and Alignment among Community Campuses across UA System. These two options are disparate and while elements of both have value, combining them into one objective may have unintended consequences. We propose that they be separated into two.

1. Increase integration with main campuses.

Comment: Increasing integration with main campuses can place constraints on a community campus that may limit its ability to expand collaboration with other community campuses. For example, UAF CTC’s integration with UAF has resulted in the college being required to charge non-resident tuition, along with many student fees applicable to the Fairbanks campus but not UAF CTC, both of which other community campuses are not required to charge. Revenue from these ‘integrated’ charges is allocated to UAF central. Thus, UAF CTC does not receive the benefit of being a community campus with lower costs to students and the integration with UAF does not result in increased revenue to the college. Lower revenue results in limited funds to pursue and develop collaboration across community campuses.

We propose the following:

- Address how to offer some community campus AAS degrees at those community campuses and main campuses that don’t offer these degrees.
a. These would need to be run through the respective curriculum processes at the affected main campuses.

- Efforts at UAA will begin this fall to determine how to best schedule e-Learning courses across the five UAA campuses.

- UAA and UAS faculty are already part of the main campus departments, attend department meetings and serve on a variety of main campus committees including governance and curriculum. Some UAF community campus faculty are members of a UAF department while others are members of specific CRCD departments.

2. Increase collaboration across community campuses.

**Comment:** UAS is one university with three campuses. In other words, Ketchikan and Sitka support programs at UAS through their course offerings. For example, the Ketchikan campus offers a good number of upper division classes to support the e-learning Bachelors of Liberal Arts and Bachelor of Arts in Social Sciences. It would be difficult for the Sitka and Ketchikan campuses to coordinate these classes with other community campuses without the involvement of the Juneau campus.

**We propose the following:**

- Discuss the possibility of the community campuses implementing a course-sharing and/or faculty sharing plan for CTE courses (to include allied health care) similar to what is already being done by UAF CTC (health, human services, applied business) and the Sitka Campus (medical assisting).

- Address how to offer some community campus AAS degrees at those community campuses and main campuses that don’t offer these degrees.
  
  a. These would need to be run through the respective curriculum processes at the affected main campuses.

- Create a limited trial for reduced-tuition CTE program offerings with Strategic Investment funds that would "hold community campuses harmless" in the event the reduced tuition fails to increase enrollment enough to offset the reduction. This idea was included in a memo sent to VP White on April 10 by the Statewide Career and Technical Education Tuition Team. Six CCDC members were on this team of 11 led by AVP Oba so the idea has already been fairly well vetted.

- Discuss and investigate course cost/ revenue sharing across Universities for requested classes offered in community campus regions that do not administer the requested programing. For example, implementing an 80/20 split for a campus offering its programs in another community campus region. The hosting campus could support with recruitment and logistics to the offering campus’s course, receiving 20% of the revenue for their efforts and support. Head count/ credit hour and 80% of the revenue would return to the offering campus.

3. Explore ways to increase campus productivity and cost effectiveness, including expansion of support for/ access to e-Learning programs from main campuses.

**Comment:** The CCDC believes this implies only a one-way expansion to eLearning (from main campuses to community campuses) and suggests this be changed to: “Explore ways to increase campus productivity and cost effectiveness, including expansion of support for/access to e-Learning programs between community campuses and main campuses.”
We propose the following:

- Consider expanding the existing UAOnline platform to list all locations/availability of programs in high-demand career and technical fields along with career clusters. It would also include information that shows which two-year degrees, one-year certificates and OECs can be completed 100% via distance, in addition to 4-year degrees, graduate degrees and graduate certificate. The University of Montana has a good example (does not include which programs can be pursued 100% via distance) https://mus.edu/Qtools/Degrees/degree_default.asp While UAOnline lists courses at all locations and delivery modalities, it does not include a search feature for degree/certificate programs. All campus web sites would have a prominent link to this site.

- While we understand the eLearning Council will be addressing this, the CCDC strongly supports the development of a system for community campuses to work with university departments in coordinating eLearning course offerings in a way that is fair to both the community campuses and university departments. Improved coordination will reduce detrimental duplication of eLearning courses, promote greater integration of community campuses and the universities, and foster better collaboration in a very meaningful way.

4. Explore potential partnerships with tribal and other community organizations. Possibilities include conversion to tribal colleges and stronger collaboration with regional vocational centers.

We propose the following:

- Create an inventory of current partnerships with community and tribal organizations that might be leveraged across the system.

- Assess potential models for partnership with new and existing tribal colleges within Alaska. Identify pros and cons to each of the models for meeting state educational and workforce needs.

- Explore how to expand the availability and increase the visibility of Alaska Native courses making them more accessible in all areas of the state.

General input:

- Encourage discussions at Summit Team level to eliminate out-of-state tuition for students enrolled in associate degree programs and undergraduate certificates.

- Request Summit Team support for community campuses to lead efforts to obtain community campus tuition relief from other sources such as federal funding or local government partnerships. At the federal level, there have been significant efforts to support workforce development in recent years.

- While we understand the Student Services Council will be addressing consolidation and standardization of “back room” functions between Universities and Statewide, as policies and processes are modified, the CCDC strongly encourages a focus on how the student experience will be impacted in both community campus and university settings. Streamlined navigation of student services will reduce confusion and promote retention and transferability within the UA system.
University of Alaska Community Campus Directors Council (CCDC)

Represented by leaders of campuses and colleges at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), University of Alaska Southeast (UAS), and University of Alaska Workforce Programs.

- UAF Community & Technical College
- UAF Kuskokwim Campus
- UAF Interior Alaska Campus
- UAF Ketchikan Campus
- UAF Prince William Sound College
- UAF KPC Kachemak Bay Campus
- UAF Bristol Bay Campus
- UAF Chukchi Campus
- UAF Sitka Campus
- UAF Kodiak College
- University of Alaska Workforce Programs
- UAA Matanuska Susitna College
- UAA KPC Kenai River Campus
- UAA Prince William Sound College
- UAA KPC Kachemak Bay Campus
- UAA Kodiak College
- University of Alaska Workforce Programs

University Policies for Respective Community Campuses, CTCs & UAS Career Education

The purpose of this document is to show the differences between the three universities’ policies regarding their “stand alone” community campuses as well as the CTCs and UAS Career Education. Many members of the various statewide Councils are likely unaware of how the campuses and CTCs/CE operate and of the differences between them. These differences should be known and considered as strategic plans are formulated to address the Strategic Pathways Decisions/Recommendations for Community Campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Structure</th>
<th>UAA Campuses</th>
<th>UAA CTC</th>
<th>UAF Rural Campuses</th>
<th>UAF CTC</th>
<th>UAS Campuses</th>
<th>UAS Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus directors report to Chancellor.</td>
<td>CTC Dean reports to the Provost.</td>
<td>Report to VC for Rural, Community and Native Education of CRCD.</td>
<td>Report to VC for Rural, Community and Native Education.</td>
<td>Campus directors report to the Provost.</td>
<td>Dean reports to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Budget</td>
<td>UAA Campuses</td>
<td>UAA CTC</td>
<td>UAF Rural Campuses</td>
<td>UAF CTC</td>
<td>UAS Campuses</td>
<td>UAS Career Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campuses responsible for own budget and spending. All revenue kept by campuses.</td>
<td>Dean responsible for college budget; 80% of tuition revenue (20% retained centrally).</td>
<td>Campuses responsible for own budget &amp; keep all tuition generated. Courses on the CRCD Cross-Regional Schedule (all distance) there is a 80/20 split between the course originating campuses &amp; receiving campus, as the receiving campus is serving students to access the course offered by the originating campus.</td>
<td>Responsible for own budget and spending. All tuition revenue except for nonresident surcharge kept by CTC. Pay all facilities and utility costs.</td>
<td>Campuses responsible for own budget and spending. All revenue kept by campuses.</td>
<td>Campuses responsible for own budget and spending. UFB returned to Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Approval (FT &amp; PT)</td>
<td>UAA Campuses</td>
<td>UAA CTC</td>
<td>UAF Rural Campuses</td>
<td>UAF CTC</td>
<td>UAS Campuses</td>
<td>UAS Career Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses hire FT faculty with Provost approval. University depts. invited to have rep on search committees. Campuses hire adjuncts.</td>
<td>College hires FT faculty with Provost approval; college depts. hire own adjuncts.</td>
<td>Campuses hire FT faculty with Provost approval. Depts. usually have rep on search committees. Campuses hire adjuncts.</td>
<td>Hires FT Faculty with Provost approval. Hires adjunct faculty through depts. with CTC Dean approval.</td>
<td>Campuses hire FT faculty with search committees composed of regional faculty; Provost and Chancellor approval required. Campuses hire adjuncts after approval from dept. &amp; Dean.</td>
<td>Hire FT faculty with Provost approval. Adjunct hires require faculty and Dean approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination of Course Offerings with University</th>
<th>UAA Campuses</th>
<th>UAA CTC</th>
<th>UAF Rural Campuses</th>
<th>UAF CTC</th>
<th>UAS Campuses</th>
<th>UAS Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited, but increasing particularly with distance offerings.</td>
<td>Seek to coordinate distance-delivered offerings and College Prep &amp; Developmental Studies writing and math.</td>
<td>CRCD faculty depts. decide on offerings; CRCD Dean addresses issues between and across campuses.</td>
<td>Dept. faculty coordinate offerings with input by CTC Dean to ensure budget availability. CTC faculty work with other UAF depts. when appropriate.</td>
<td>Sequenced on regional 6-year schedule across campuses. Sequence &amp; changes to the sequence are initiated by regional faculty through dept. chairs &amp; reviewed and approved by the Dean.</td>
<td>Schedule is coordinated across the three campuses for all distance &amp; F2F classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UAA Campuses</td>
<td>UAA CTC</td>
<td>UAF Rural Campuses</td>
<td>UAF CTC</td>
<td>UAS Campuses</td>
<td>UAS Career Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division (LD)/Upper Division (UD) Offerings, Course &amp; Instructor Approval</strong></td>
<td>Campuses can offer LD courses at their discretion. UD courses and instructors must be approved by respective UAA dept. chair and UAA Dean.</td>
<td>As one of the UAA colleges, approves its own scheduling and instructors for all levels of coursework. CTC also provides zero-level coursework for UAA. Offer numerous technical Associate’s and Bachelor’s degree programs.</td>
<td>Campuses offer all local program (certificate, AAS &amp; bachelors’ courses) and GERS. Non-program UD courses must be approved by respective dept. and Dean. Rarely seek to offer non-program UD courses; are occasionally invited to offer an UD distance course.</td>
<td>Offers LD courses at their discretion. Offers UD courses with instructor approval and justification for need. Must obtain instructor approval for all courses (LD and UD) outside of programmatic areas. CTC offers a couple of UD courses within CTC’s disciplines that do not require approval.</td>
<td>Campuses can offer both LD/UD classes. The actual scheduling for each semester is based on the regional six year sequence.</td>
<td>Offer LD at their discretion. No UD offered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission
- This council provides coordination and collaboration to promote best practices in development, alumni relations, and advancement services throughout UA.
- This council provides a framework to support system-wide initiatives and campaigns that seek to do one or more of the following: significantly increase private giving to the university; expand the university’s donor base; improve the level and quality of alumni engagement across the UA System; and, increase public support and awareness of the university’s impact on Alaska.

Scope
- This council will meet monthly to discuss system-wide development and alumni relations functions including: coordinated fundraising; annual, major, special, and planned giving; advancement services including donor relations and stewardship; and, campaign initiatives.

Goals
- Promote thoughtful, integrated, best-practice alumni relations and development plans.
  - Strategic engagement that creates affinity for, awareness of, and support for excellence at the University of Alaska; connecting alumni and donors to students, faculty, academic leaders, and researchers.
  - Evaluation of barriers to quality advancement work at the UA System, such as staffing, budget levels and reporting structures.
  - Collaboration and coordination with the University Relations council.

Measurement/Reporting
- Increase private support for the university, as measured by industry-standard goals for volunteerism, engagement and gifts.

Members
- Chair, Foundation President -- Susan Foley
- VP, University Relations, Statewide – Michelle Rizk
- Executive Director, UA Foundation – Megan Riebe
- VC, University Advancement, UAA – Megan Olson
- Director, Development & Alumni Relations, UAS – Lynne Johnson
- Director, Development & Alumni Relations, UAF – Emily Drygas
- Director, Alumni Relations/Executive Director UAF Alumni Association – Kate Ripley
- AVC, Alumni, UAA – Rachel Morse
- Dean, SOM, UAF - Mark Hermann
- Dean, Engineering, UAF – Doug Goering
- Dean, Engineering, UAA – Fred Barlow
- Interim Dean, CBPP, UAA – Bogdan Hoanca
- Manager, Alumni, UAS – Jessica Post
The Development Council is in an unusual position among System-wide Councils in that it does not have a Strategic Pathways plan to shape its goals. Because of this, the council has had the opportunity to explore the priorities both of the UA System and of the various constituencies represented. In the absence of Strategic Pathways, this council intends, among other things, to look to consultant reports for reference.

As noted in the attached charter, this council plans to support and expand initiatives and functions that increase private giving, expand the university’s donor base, and improve alumni engagement on every level of the UA system. Among the immediate barriers to these goals, this council intends to examine staffing, budget levels, and reporting structures. In order to meet the mission parameters as set forth in the charter, the council has tentatively noted four significant areas of interest. These areas are as follows:

1. Scholarships for Recruiting Purposes. This council notes that, when compared to other universities, UA has ceased to offer competitive scholarships, both in terms of relative funds and the timely manner that they are offered to students.
2. Philanthropy Initiative. This council hopes to explore and expand the donor base among alumni and around the state.
3. Data Flow. The Foundation and Development departments currently rely heavily on data from Raiser’s edge. The council notes, however, that there are other resources not being utilized that have the potential to improve alumni engagement.
4. Best Practices for Events. Events, for the purposes of this council, are defined as measuring strategic engagement rather than applying monetary value to specific kinds of events. This priority area is closely connected to data flow, as strategic engagement relies on data and statistics.

The council is in the process of reviewing these goals and areas of interest, and intends to establish priorities before the Summit Council meets in October.

Additionally, the Development Council has agreed to request that the name of the council be changed to the Development and Alumni Council to reflect the significance of alumni relations to the various constituencies represented in the council.

Susan Behlke Foley
University of Alaska Human Resources Council Charter

A. Mission

1. To collaborate system-wide to improve consistency and efficiency.
2. To strategically support UA HR’s mission to attract, hire, retain and develop the best employees.
3. To prioritize major human resources projects, e.g. automation, compliance, back office consolidation.
4. To advise the president and other university officers on HR strategic initiatives.

B. Scope

1. Advise & support HR Strategic Pathways initiatives
2. Advise & support HR initiatives for improved consistency and effectiveness
3. Build relationships to support a collective University HR and the UA HR strategic plan.
4. Consult on policies and regulations as appropriate.

C. Reporting to Summit Team

1. UA HR Strategic Plan updates
2. Performance metrics

D. Members

CHRO, SW - Keli McGee (Chair)
Director, HR, UAA - Ron Kamahele
Director, HR, UAF - Brad Lobland
Director, HR, UAS - Gail Cheney
Director, Labor Relations, SW - Geoff Bacon
Director, Compensation, SW - Tara Ferguson
Director, Benefits, SW - Erika Van Flein
Director, Accounting & HRIS, SW - Michelle Pope
Dean, CNSM, UAF - Paul Layer
Dean, CA&S, UAA - John Stalvey
Ad Hoc as appropriate - approved through CHRO

E. Meeting Schedule

- Monthly via video
- Twice annually face to face

F. Goals

UA HR Strategic Plan

G. Interaction with Other Councils

Business Council, Advancement Council, & IT Council, as needed

H. Communication Plan

To be developed
Human Resources Council  
Meeting Summary  

September 5, 2017  

**Review and Finalize HRC Charter**  
Charter reviewed, edited and approved by HRC. The Charter will be transmitted to President Johnsen for review.  

**Prioritize Top Projects for 2018**  

Desired Outcomes for HRC  

- Collaboration and streamlining of HR functions.  
- Get feedback and support so that HRC can be an advocate for HR goals and projects.  
- Work collaboratively to ensure HR processes more consistently streamlined. Consistent treatment of staff, faculty, and all employees in unions.  
- Consistency balanced with the needs of those doing the work.  
- Work toward one HR.  
- Work together to add value to employees including those at rural campuses.  
- Establishing overall priorities so we can support the UA mission most effectively.  
- Are we doing our best to attract the best candidates? Are we showing that this is the best place to be?  
- Getting to yes – customer friendly – self service.  
- Be more proactive in attracting a diverse body of applications.  

**Future Expectations**  

1. **Future meetings**: Meet monthly by phone and face to face twice a year. Next meeting will be held via video. The first face to face meeting will be held April – June.  
2. **Education**: Future briefs on various functions, automation and streamlining projects, and a comparison of SW and campus HR.  

**Action Items**  

1. Share finalized HRC Charter with President Johnsen.  
2. Resend link to HRC Google Folder to council members.
Institutional Research System-wide Council
Charter

Mission
The council exists to promote and support system-wide capacity for collection and analysis of data to guide decisions that improve success on behalf of the University of Alaska System of Higher education, with an emphasis on optimizing resources for the achievement of UAA, UAF, UAS, SW’s and UA’s missions.

Scope
The scope of the Institutional Research System-wide council is to provide oversight of the following functions, both central and distributed:

○ Collaborative knowledge network (ongoing)
○ Data architecture, governance and administration
○ Education and advocacy regarding data-informed decision making

Goals
1) Develop and lead collaborative, cross-functional plans, strategies, programs and activities, supporting, facilitating and otherwise informing the mission of the council. Priority is on process improvement, standardization, and automation. Promote trust and credibility.

Deliverable: Creation and implementation of a Collaborative Knowledge Network (CKN).

2) Establish and maintain a common data architecture and data governance system, including goals, policy, common procedures, strategies, and system of documentation.

Deliverable: Define and advance integration of basic, common data architecture principles and best practices across administrative support and mission area functions system-wide, i.e. standards for data acquisition, accessibility and integrity, reporting protocols and tools, and improving business practices.

3) Promote a university culture that has a basic understanding of, and systematically places value on, the collection and analysis of data to guide decisions that improve success, i.e. data-informed decision-making.

Deliverable: Widespread, demonstrated buy-in to the value of data-informed decision making across all university levels and functions, from executives, to technical decision makers, to data entry personnel.

Subcommittee(s)
The council will designate sub-committees, teams or individuals responsible to accomplish objectives in support of the council mission and scope. These may be permanent or ad hoc in nature, and are accountable to ensure the assigned objectives are successfully completed, including communication of outcomes, recommendations, initiatives and/or decisions to the Committee.
Institutional Research System-wide Council
Charter

Reporting / Communication plan
- Share monthly agenda items and meeting outcomes with other system-wide councils, campus and other constituents.
- Communicate roll-out plans for initiatives to key stakeholders, i.e. Summit group, IR function listserv, functional area(s), etc.

Chair
AVP IRPA, UA - Gwendolyn Gruenig

Members
CITO, SW – Karl Kowalski
AV Provost, IR, UAA – Erin Holmes
Director,PAIR, UAF – Ian Olson
Director, IE, UAS – Brad Ewing
Provost, UAS – Karen Carey
VC, Student Affairs, UAA – Bruce Schultz
Dean, COE, UA - vacant, participate when appointed
Dean, CA&S, UAA – John Stalvey
Staff support: Rita Murphy or Kelly Ott, UA IRPA Research Analyst

Appointment of a proxy representative to authoritatively represent member’s interests in his or her absence for committee business is encouraged.

Meeting Schedule
First meeting: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 from 1:30 – 2:30 p.m.
Weekly meetings through September 1, 2017, meetings will be held monthly thereafter
Face-to-face meetings will be held twice annually

Plan for interaction with other councils
Interaction/collaboration with all councils as necessary and with other councils as issues require.
In late June 2017 Institutional Research System-wide council membership was formally expanded via a global update to the organization and roles of all UA system-wide councils. The newly formalized Institutional Research System-wide Council includes the four IR officers from UAA, UAF, UAS and UA/SW as well as leaders from IT, Student Services, Academic Affairs and academic units, each bringing valuable perspective to the group.

Initial deliverables assigned to the council included creation of a draft council charter and an initial report and implementation plan for the proposed Collaborative Knowledge Network. To address this charge, the Council adopted an aggressive schedule of weekly meetings between July 17 and August 29, 2017.

A final, draft charter for consideration and approval was unanimously adopted by the council on August 22.

The Collaborative Knowledge Network report and implementation analysis required the council to deal with a number of intricate issues, both technical and strategic. As the Strategic Pathways IR Options team first noted, the CKN is the most promising option relative to the charge, as well as the most difficult option to successfully implement relative to the current state of the university system. The council's initial report and action plan elements was completed September 8 and is undergoing a last review by committee members.
Collaborative Knowledge Network Report and Implementation Planning

Institutional Research System-wide Council

September 8, 2017
Introduction

The Institutional Research Council formed in 2004 and since inception has served as a primary conduit for communication, collaboration and decision-making by IR leaders and staff. Collaboration has been a core value of the IR function for nearly two decades. Many of the “low hanging” fruit relative to improving operations have already been picked, so to speak, leaving only the more challenging and/or complicated strategies going forward. Institutional research professionals within the UA system understand the priorities set by the BOR, President, and university leadership, and are as responsive as possible to those needs under the current operating conditions.

In late June 2017 IR council membership was formally expanded via a global update to the organization and roles of all UA system-wide councils. The newly formalized Institutional Research System-wide Council membership includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAA</th>
<th>UAF</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>UA/SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erin Holmes</td>
<td>Ian Olson</td>
<td>Brad Ewing</td>
<td>Gwendolyn Gruenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Shultz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Carey</td>
<td>Karl Kowalski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stalvey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, CoE (tbd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new IR Council was directed as follows:

1. Creation of a Collaborative Knowledge Network will be pursued without delay. It will be led by a newly formalized IR Council with members from Statewide and each university. Priority should be on process improvement, standardization, and automation.

2. The IR Council will present its initial report and implementation plan to the President September 1.

To address this charge, the Council adopted an aggressive schedule of weekly meetings between July 17 and August 29, 2017, developing the Collaborative Knowledge Network report and implementation planning information presented herein.

1 Due date updated to September 8, 2017.
Findings

This document outlines CKN items the IR System-wide council identified as reasonable for immediate pursuit, as well as giving a comprehensive look at the viability of each CKN component, and feedback on areas identified for further analysis.

The Collaborative Knowledge Network (CKN) concept was identified by the Strategic Pathways IR Council Options team as the “optimal mix of decentralization and consolidation that will support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through the division of labor, and the systematic use of automation, data and process standardization, and intercampus collaboration.” The team noted that while the CKN was the most promising option relative to the charge, it was also the most difficult option to successfully implement, relative to the current state of the university system. A number of the best practices identified in the CKN have been attempted in the past with varying outcomes and long-term sustainability, and/or are already occurring to some degree now. This report focuses on clearing a path to success for implementation of many, if not all, of the CKN elements, over time. Appendix A, starting on page 7, describes the CKN option proposal in detail.

The following is a summary of next steps for implementation planning:

Level 1 – Data Architecture, Governance, and Administration/Warehousing

• Significant improvements in documentation related to IR-produced data products
  
  o Adopted process for developing/updating and documenting data and data definitions in a systematic, collaborative manner will be refined and updated based on experiences and needs of individuals who used the process, as well as those identified in the RACI matrix who did not participate in the process over the last year.

  o For significant improvement, leadership will need to consistently require use of such a process. This may necessitate more planning time and cross-functional, cross-university/SW work by leaders and staff on the front end of data-related projects and proposals, resulting over time in delivery of better information and avoidance of costly re-work to fix issues identified post-implementation.

---

• IR work will utilize the same applications, server, and database
  o This item looks to improve efficiency and effectiveness of resource use in support of the Level 1 function. First step is to assess the technical impacts and resource requirements of transitioning away from the partially duplicative maintenance of major database/data warehouse instances at UA/SW and UAA, each utilizing different database types (Oracle and MS SQL server). There may be significant near-term resource and time costs to both UA/SW IR and IT, and UAA IR to effect the transition.
  o Second step is to set deliverables and timeline to transition to a common set of data administration and warehousing tools and one data warehouse instance, including identification of accountable and responsible entities.
  
• Other items, such as the addition of Level 1 staff FTE, may be more difficult to implement now. Full details are available in the matrix provided in Appendix B, starting on page 12 of this report.

Level 2 – Reporting

• The first step toward adopting all Level 2 items is for the IR Council and each university/SW community to reach a mutual understanding and agreement of what is appropriate to share.

• Second step is to establish and populate a centrally available, queriable repository for work products in this category. Several viable options for such a repository are in use at UA now.

• Utilize a common set of tools for Level 2 work
  o Council supports leveraging and scaling up a set of core, automated SharePoint reports based on the suite of work products collaboratively developed and in use by UAA and UAS. Support resources for this effort are intended to become available through reduction of database/data warehouse redundancy described in Level 1.

Level 3 - Analytics

• Identify examples of past advanced analytics projects conducted in IR offices.
  o This can begin immediately.
  o A venue for regular sharing should be identified.

• Share the models, methodologies, final reports, etc. with the other IR offices so that each office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a model, methodology, final report, etc. that already exists elsewhere in the system.
First step toward implementing this item is for the IR Council and the university community to reach a mutual understanding and agreement of what is appropriate to share.

Next step is to establish and populate a centrally available, queriable repository for work products in this category.

The remaining Level 3 item, identification of a common set of tools for advanced analytics, may be more difficult to implement now. Full details are available in the matrix provided in Appendix B for Level 3 on page 13.

Areas for Further Analysis

Five broad topics were identified along with the CKN concept as requiring further analysis for implementation planning. Each topic and a summary of observations follow.

A. Executive Commitment: genuine, broad, and sustained over multiple years
This item refers to a willingness and commitment of leaders throughout the university community to consistently support best practice strategies and principals for the IR function. Operational and strategic choices sometimes appear to be made based on what will create the least disruption or controversy, although the more challenging or complicated choice was identified as optimal to move the IR function forward.

B. Change Management
This item refers to the need for continuous quality assessment and quality control principals to be actively applied to the CKN as it is developed and maintained. Such principals should be purposefully and systematically applied to business practices within IR, as well as in other key functions having significant impact on IR’s ability to be effective. For example, the IR council identified and several suggestions for the IT Council’s consideration that would significantly improve the IR function’s ability to meet its charge. See Appendix C, starting on page 14.

C. Governance Structure
On a day-to-day basis, this is a key consideration for successful CKN implementation and maintenance. The Institutional Research System-wide council needs to develop and implement an appropriate structure. Several governance models are commonly identified at the national level for the contemporary IR function⁴ that may serve as a starting point for consideration.
D. Resource Analysis

The council discussed the need for each IR office to provide some basic information as a starting point for resource analysis and identification of areas where further optimization may be possible. Examples of key information includes, but is not limited to: mission responsibilities, which are unique among the four offices; a catalog of services and routine reporting; areas of relative strength and weakness; available resources (staff, space, software licensing, etc.). A formal resource analysis of the IR function was last conducted in 2004 for the Administrative Operating Effectiveness and Cost Savings Review\(^3\), and may provide some structure for cataloging and analyzing this area today.

E. Equitable Allocation of Resources

A reasonable allocation of resources under the new CKN paradigm is yet to be defined. Over the last several years, staffing levels at some IR offices have grown while reductions occurred at other offices. This is assumed to simply be the observed result of different administrative approaches and priorities in meeting annual “MAU” level budget shortfalls over the last few years, as well as differences in the magnitude of annual cuts needing to be absorbed at each “MAU”. The way in which IR resources could be equalized under a new operational model should be carefully considered.

Other Considerations

The challenges faced by UA’s IR function are not unique. Key observations made in the recent publication *A New Vision for Institutional Research* (Swing and Ross, 2016)\(^4\) are directly relevant to the topics covered in this report and may help identify how IR should plan to adapt for maximum effectiveness over time.

---

\(^3\) Available online at: [https://drive.google.com/a/alaska.edu/file/d/0B8087puEXVA0uNTRibHFLeJBaNEFCN2xalXpxcS1GMUhpenl3/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/a/alaska.edu/file/d/0B8087puEXVA0uNTRibHFLeJBaNEFCN2xalXpxcS1GMUhpenl3/view?usp=sharing)

What is the Collaborative Knowledge Network?

The “Collaborative Knowledge Network” was one of four options identified by the IR Strategic Pathways Phase 2 Options Team. A summary of the CKN option 4 follows.

Charge to the IR Strategic Pathways Phase 2, Options Team: Develop and review options for organizational restructuring of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness.

Scope: All of Institutional Research across the UA system.

Goals: Reduce operating costs. Align with UA priorities.

Team Members
- Ellis Ott
- John Stalvey
- Karen Schmitt
- Austin Tagaban
- Diane Wagner
- Doug Johnson, PGS Facilitator
- Brad Ewing
- Faye Gallant
- Mary Gower
- Gwen Gruenig
- Coy Gullett
- Orion Lawlor
- Ian Olson

Key Stakeholders
- Legislators
- Employers
- Public Agencies
- Parents
- Alumni
- Executive Leadership
- Board of Regents
- Faculty
- Staff
- Students
- Community

Institutional Research Staff FTE Distribution: Transformation via the Collaborative Knowledge Network
Option 4 – Collaborative Knowledge Network

Narrative Description

The Collaborative Knowledge Network option was developed by the IR Strategic Pathways team to identify the optimal mix of decentralization and consolidation that will support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through the division of labor, and the systematic use of automation, data and process standardization, and intercampus collaboration. This option recognizes the importance of streamlining processes and technologies across the four IR offices while also maintaining IR expertise and leadership at each institution. Broad changes have been proposed for the implementation team’s consideration that will (1) significantly increase IR’s contributions to standardized data warehousing and automated reporting, (2) decrease IR’s efforts focused on manually developing static reports, and (3) increase IR’s capabilities focused on advanced analytics and complex research projects. These changes are expected to result in reduced institutional operating costs over time and increased access to accurate, current, and consistently collected information that is meaningful, insightful, and action-oriented.

Implementing the Collaborative Knowledge Network option would naturally lead to a few challenges related to streamlining processes and technologies. Additionally, this option would be the most complex to implement due to the highly collaborative nature of this model. Broad leadership buy-in and a sustained multi-year commitment from the executive level would be central to the successful implementation of this option.

Diagram Overview

The IR Strategic Pathways team has developed a diagram to clarify the broad changes that have been proposed as part of the Collaborative Knowledge Network option. The vertical axis has been disaggregated by three of the main functions that the four IR offices provide to their institutions: (1) data warehousing, (2) operational reporting, and (3) advanced analytics. Current workloads at each IR office result in most of the FTE focused on level 2. However, the IR Strategic Pathways team sees value in increasing the FTE focused on level 1, reducing FTE focused on level 2, and increasing the FTE focused on level 3-resulting in a shift from a fishbowl-shaped organizational structure to an hour-glass shaped organizational structure.
Level 1: Streamline queries and applications for database extraction, business intelligence reporting, and advanced analytics. Centralize most database queries and views in a new database schema that links directly with automated reports. A new operational database analyst—complementing the existing DSDMGR database analyst—manages this schema and co-develops queries, views, and tables with each IR office to ensure that they are accurate and meaningful. All IR offices will work from the same applications, server, and database. Significant improvements in documentation related to IR-produced tables, queries, functions, procedures, etc.

Level 2: Identify a core set of reports developed by each IR office. Share report designs, benchmarks, best practices, etc. so that each IR office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a report that already exists elsewhere in the system. Well-designed database-linked automated reports can—over time—replace some of the efforts that currently consume a significant amount of time for daily reporting and open/close freeze reporting. This will allow IR offices to develop new and higher quality reports, increase data literacy at each institution, and focus on complex research projects and advanced analytics.

Level 3: Determine the appropriate applications that should be used at each IR office to conduct advanced analytics. Identify examples of past advanced analytics projects conducted in IR offices. Share the models, methodologies, final reports, etc. with the other IR offices so that each office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a model, methodology, final report, etc. that already exists elsewhere in the system.
Option 4 continued – Collaborative Knowledge Network

Key Change Elements

- **Offering Changes**: Increased capacity for managing the data warehouse will increase the time available to develop well-designed reports that follow best practices and conduct deeper research and advanced analytics that follow best practices. Potential to provide higher level of service. Promotes a more open sharing environment for database queries and report designs. Day-to-day IR tasks would be more efficient. Increased capacity to answer ‘big questions’.

- **Staffing Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Changes</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Option 4a</th>
<th>Option 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Data Warehousing</td>
<td>1 FTE</td>
<td>3 FTE</td>
<td>4 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Operational Reporting</td>
<td>16 FTE</td>
<td>10 FTE</td>
<td>10 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Advanced Analytics</td>
<td>2 FTE</td>
<td>6 FTE</td>
<td>7 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19 FTE</td>
<td>19 FTE</td>
<td>21 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **4a = Current FTE levels applied to Collaborative Knowledge Network option**
- **4b = Added investment in IR applied to Collaborative Knowledge Network option**
- **Note**: This table provides approximations for illustrative purposes and ultimately may vary depending on the decisions by the implementation team and executive leadership.

- **Use of Facilities/Technology**: Similar to current levels. Small increase in license fees for advanced analytics software. Automation would not require much investment if the UA System follows the process currently used by UAA IR and UAS IE (e.g. SSMS, Reporting Services, SharePoint, Excel). However, if a different application is purchased (e.g. EAB APS, Tableau, Domo, etc.) this could require significant upfront investment and recurring costs.

- **Access for Students and Other Clients**: Access should increase significantly due to increased collaboration across the four IR offices, improved data warehousing, automated reports (data portals and dashboards).

- **Administration**: Current services to the universities and system offices would be maintained.

- **Front-End Investment**: Dependent on details from implementation team. Any new costs are seen by the group as investments with real potential to improve efficiencies and increase revenue throughout the system.

- **Community (External) Engagement**: Public-facing self-service data interface would increase access to accurate, current, and consistently collected data.

- **Product Quality**: Increased availability of accurate, current, and consistently collected data that can be linked with automated reports. Automated reports and advanced analytics projects would be developed and designed by each IR office for executives, staff, faculty, students, etc. at their institution. Increased quality of the design of reports and the increased use of national standard benchmarks and best practices.
**Option 4 continued – Collaborative Knowledge Network**

### Pros and Cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a transformative option, that if executed well, will make IR a more strategic asset</td>
<td>Most complex to implement because of the highly collaborative nature of this model; requires willingness to compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides actionable knowledge</td>
<td>Additional resources needed to accelerate results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports increasing revenue</td>
<td>No new investment risks the success of the option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieves automation and customization</td>
<td>Time to implement and sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favors shared services where appropriate</td>
<td>Negotiating through the redistribution of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains efficiency through division of labor and focus on specialization</td>
<td>This option could be more difficult to communicate due to the complexity which could impact political perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes skill pathway, flattens the learning curve, reduces turnover costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codifies and increases collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a collaborative culture and diversity of thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports wider access to information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most responsive to a variety of customers across Alaska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps answer the really big questions and supports strategic thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents need for shadow IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports higher product quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best opportunity to shift to a more data-driven decision making culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates the structure to promote knowledge generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an environment where various skill sets can thrive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This model promotes a more proactive leadership role for IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates framework for building an effective governance structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster response times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More easily adaptable to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready for Implementation?</td>
<td>Committee Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, following successful identification and adoption of prioritization criteria, common method for documenting and sharing.</td>
<td>Implement a consistent method/language for sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, conditional on base funding for an IS Professional position being made available through reallocation or new source.</td>
<td>Criteria for identifying the most impactful, priority items that should be focused on for this work are not mutually agreed to and should be established before this work begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, pending assessment and understanding of impacts and resource requirements.</td>
<td>Eventually, reduction or elimination of duplication of effort occurring now at UA and UUA will free up staff capacity for other activities. It may also help address some performance issues occurring now with required daily transfers of large amounts of raw data between the two systems, by performing data transformation and load processes on the same server.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, dependent on clear, sustained executive commitment, resource dedication, and necessary process improvements are required to implement.</td>
<td>Gaps in documentation for data definitions are more apparent and easier to identify when data are actually used. UAS and UUA expressed concern that identifying this as a prerequisite element will hinder progress on CKN implementation, while UA/SW and UAF identify this as a critical step towards advancing a more coherent and accessible data service to the broader university community. Documentation of this kind of information exists today in an undocumented manner, a kind of institutional memory that is lost when IR professionals retire or otherwise move on. This step is perceived to be best accomplished over time in an iterative, incremental way, i.e., documentation is constantly improved as new knowledge is obtained and old systems/methods fail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 2. Systematically move from semi-automated/manual work toward fully automated work products in this area, freeing up staff capacity for Level 1 and Level 3 work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify a core set of reports developed by each IR office.</th>
<th>Share report designs, benchmarks, best practices, etc. so that each IR office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a report that already exists elsewhere in the system.</th>
<th>Well-designed database-linked automated reports can—over time—replace some of the efforts that currently consume a significant amount of time for daily reporting and open/close freeze reporting. This will allow IR offices to develop new and higher quality reports, increase data literacy at each institution, and focus on complex research projects and advanced analytics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ready for Implementation?</strong></td>
<td>Pending: mutual understanding and agreements on what is appropriate to share.</td>
<td>Pending: mutual understanding and agreements on what is appropriate to share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Comments</strong></td>
<td>This step seems to be the inventory work that is frequently identified as a need.</td>
<td>A queriable repository needs to be used for these kinds of outputs. Work products may not always be adopted without modification, however having direct access to the library of work completed by others would be helpful in seeing &quot;how they did it&quot;. Such sharing sometimes occurs easily now for reports and data products in cases when one office is aware a report exists and/or the authoring office is willing and able to share. On the flip side, there are situations where sharing does not occur for unknown reasons, or when the product may be considered proprietary (recruitment plans, proposal applications, etc.), sensitive or potentially damaging to the university now or in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current State</strong></td>
<td>Entire universe of UA/SW data, code, work products and projects are available to each university IR office via Redbear shared server and data warehouse. These are mined and utilized by IR staff now, however a comprehensive system for indexing would make use much easier. University to UA/SW and University to University work product availability is not well understood at this time.</td>
<td>University to UA/SW - see above comment about need for better organization for use by universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need to Address &amp; Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>Recommend sharing information about all reports to allow for identification of the core reports.</td>
<td>UA/SW - Recommend sharing all work, with a limited number of clearly articulated, justifiable exceptions spelled out in advance. A common, queritable repository should be identified and adopted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 3. High institutional ROI for IR capacity applied in this area, utilizing complex analysis and predictive analytics, machine learning, and data visualization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determine the appropriate applications that should be used at each IR office to conduct advanced analytics.</th>
<th>Identify examples of past advanced analytics projects conducted in IR offices.</th>
<th>Share the models, methodologies, final reports, etc. with the other IR offices so that each office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a model, methodology, final report, etc. that already exists elsewhere in the system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ready for Implementation?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pending: mutual understanding and agreement on what is appropriate to share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Comments</strong></td>
<td>There were a spectrum of reactions to this item, summarized here. Supporting: Having a standard set of technology for this purpose makes development of mining easier, lowers cost of software and infrastructure, ensures portability of technical pieces like code, and promotes collaboration. Neutral: This could be implemented later after earlier steps are established. Not in support: To dictate what software should be used is not appropriate. IR offices should take advantage of the different skills of IR employees, not lock people into learning something new just for the sake of standardization of software; the skills set of IR type people in Alaska are narrow. Historically, the old IR council was a venue for regular presentations of university analytics projects.</td>
<td>The university perspective was that research questions are often unique to each institution, and research conducted at one university is not appropriate for another university. UA/SW’s perspective was that some research is applicable across campuses or universities if of interest to the BOR or legislature or if considering student populations that attend more than one campus or university. There is support to have a forum to share information, for example the &quot;PAIR Share&quot; one-hour sessions – it’s helpful to explain to colleagues what we do and how we do it. Knowledge in this way expands and collaboration strengthens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current State</strong></td>
<td>Variety of applications in use, including SAS, R, SPSS, STATA, Excel and a number of others. Currently, the tool is selected based on the task and the analyst's personal comfort with a given tool.</td>
<td>Historically, the old IR council was a venue for regular presentation of university analytics projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need to Address &amp; Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>Recommend implementing this item after progress is made on fundamental Level 1 and 2 tasks.</td>
<td>This activity will need to be made a priority relative to existing backlog of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to: What are the top 5 IT “pain points”, roadblocks or opportunities for improvement, from the perspective of your area?

1) Meet the first charge of the Information Technology Council: “Establish IT policy and administrative and operational standards”

   · In alignment with the adopted objectives of the ITC’s charter, e.g. articulating priorities in support of mission, and decision authority cut points relative to cost, scope, stakeholder and/or customer impact, etc.

   · Adopt a process and timeline to reach completion

2) UA/UAA/UAF/UAS Executive level commitment (genuine, broad and sustained over multiple years) to utilize and support the Project Management function and its operations in accordance with standard best practices:

   · Transparent, inclusive, complete project vetting, prioritization and planning functions, used for all projects of a minimum scope and magnitude, as defined in IT policy and administrative and operational standards (item 1).

   · Transparent project portfolio management, connecting resource planning with project execution

3) Include IR as a primary stakeholder and/or customer in potential modifications to data and applications environment, to prevent data discontinuity and allow UA’s data architecture development, maintenance and BI needs to be met (in accordance with cut point criteria defined in IT policy and administrative and operational standards (item 1)). IR function is responsible to set data and data architecture standards to meet trend reporting, operational analysis, and compliance needs. Items to address in this area include, for example:

   · Communicate when applications are being adopted and how data will articulate with Banner – whether data source is SaaS or locally hosted, transparency on data structure and how it will articulate; include addition of RPTP snapshots of databases/applications not intended or possible to articulate to Banner, i.e. Adirondack, Lumens, Raiser’s Edge, defined to meet IR’s and their customer’s needs as part of application implementation plan.
· Maintain easily accessible living technical documentation for core data services/products such as RPTP data refresh schedules, reports schema, data structures for RPTP snapshots of Banner, Lumens, Adirondack data, etc.
· When programmers are requested to modify Banner, ensure IR and other stakeholders are consulted and informed, i.e. web time entry solution changed how data flows through Banner, causing surprise issues and rework for IR.
· Expanded management/archiving of RPTP tables and other data services through automated ETL of daily snapshots, allowing for year-over-year operational analysis, i.e. cubes or snapshots with value added fields.
· Support IR in attaching visual analytic software (e.g., dashboards, business intelligence tools) directly to RPTP.

4) Communication & Setting Realistic Expectations. Providing information that is understandable and accurate will prevent any perception of a lack of responsiveness.
· Identify key points of contact for each IT function, at UA, UAF, UAA and UAS. This allows for development of relationships and understanding between IT personnel and IR (or any other function’s) personnel.
· Set and clearly communicate realistic service level and timing expectations, updating customers as needed
· Translate the IT organizational structure, functions and responsibilities to layperson speak and communicate to the UA community - explain what IT leaders and staff across the whole system actually do, and indicate who is responsible for what. Right now, organizational structure is stated in undefined IT terms that laypeople (and many others) do not understand or relate to.

We don’t have a 5th priority - these 4 are the most important.
The Information Technology Council (ITC) was formed in the Fall of 2016 in accordance with the System wide IT Governance project. The Council has been operating since February 2017 under a charter approved by President Johnsen. A slightly revised charter is included as part of this report and for review by the Summit Team.

The Information Technology Council (ITC) is a standing body within the University of Alaska created to establish IT policy and administrative and operational standards, to analyze and set priorities for investment in information technology initiatives, and to ensure excellence and best practice in implementation in a way that directly supports UA mission attainment.

The ITC is responsible for defining level 2 and level 3 governance committees, establishing the procedures and standards by which they operate, and will be accountable for the work of those groups in accordance with policies, practices, and standards.

The ITC will establish and cultivate Enterprise Architecture strategies throughout the organization and specify priority, supported and best-practice architectures throughout system establishing measures as needed to ensure a common strategy.

The ITC will advise the University of Alaska (UA) President and Summit Team and is charged to consider, decide and/or recommend strategic or operationally significant matters relating to shared and potentially shared Information Technology, according to the policies and processes of the University of Alaska. It is responsible for overseeing the analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of designated UA shared IT services in facilitation of the UA Mission.

**Guiding Principles:** The ITC will be distinguished as a collaborative, student-focused group with transparency and consultation across all its members; planning for matters such as relevant Cabinet, Summit or Board agendas; identification of responsible individuals to undertake tasks agreed to by the Council; and other work products of the Council.

The ITC will engage with other UA Executive Councils and business and academic leaders in support of all service initiatives. The ITC will ensure strategic alignment of IT initiatives, appropriate allocation of UA resources as to avoid unnecessary duplication, and mission-focused outcomes that allow strategic mission differentiation when necessary.

**Values:** The ITC will embody the values of being: student and mission focused, data-driven, transparent, inclusive, collaborative, timely, responsive, service oriented and respectful.

**Members:**
2017-2018
Karl Kowalski, UA Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO)
Martha Mason, CIO, UAF, Fairbanks
Adam Paulick, Interim CIO, UAA
Michael Ciri, CIO, UA Southeast
VACANT, Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research
Myron Dosch, Chief Financial Officer
Keli McGee, Chief Human Resources Officer
Gwen Gruenig, Assoc.Vice-President for Planning, Budget and Strategy
Saichi Oba, Chief Student Services Officer
Sam Gingerich, Provost, UAA
Kari Burrell, Vice-Chancellor of Administration UAF
Joe Nelson, Vice Chancellor for Student Services UAS
Bob Metcalf, Community Campus Director, Northwest Campus, Nome

Systemwide chairs of each:
Coalition of Student Leaders, Colby Freel
Staff Alliance, Kara Axx
Faculty Alliance, Lisa Hoferkamp

2016-2017
Karl Kowalski, UA Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO)
Martha Mason, CIO, UAF, Fairbanks
Adam Paulick, Interim CIO, UAA
Michael Ciri, CIO, UA Southeast
Dan White, Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research
Myron Dosch, Chief Financial Officer
Keli McGee,Chief Human Resources Officer
Gwen Gruenig, Assoc. Vice-President for Planning, Budget and Strategy
Saichi Oba, Chief Student Services Officer
Sam Gingerich, Provost, UAA
Kari Burrell, Vice-Chancellor of Administration UAF
Joe Nelson, Vice Chancellor for Student Services UAS
Bob Metcalf, Community Campus Director, Northwest Campus, Nome

Systemwide chairs of each:
Coalition of Student Leaders, Colby Freel
Staff Alliance, Nate Bauer,
Faculty Alliance, Tara Smith

Meetings:

The Council has met monthly since February 2017.

Activities and Actions:
One of the first tasks of The Council was to prioritize system wide IT spend reduction recommendations for achieving FY18 budget reduction and Strategic Pathways targets. These activities took much of the Spring with the ITC tasking the CIO Management Team with categorization, prioritization and explanation of impact. While the group identified many potential cost savings that are being turned into projects to implement, the larger discussions that have greater impact and implications were deferred.

Cost savings initiatives to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Reduction Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Reduction 20% FY15 All-in IT Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central IT Position Reduction FY15-FY17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-$4,900,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed IT Position Reduction FY15-FY17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-$4,800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Contract Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 18 Central IT Position Reduction Statewide OIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-$497,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Central IT Position Reduction UAF (OIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-$457,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Network Contract Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Oracle Contract Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audioconference Rate reduction (systemwide, distributed savings)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-$37,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FY18 Distributed IT Reductions UAA tentative        | 10       |                     |
| FY18 Distributed IT Reductions UAF tentative        | 4        |                     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction to date:</th>
<th>Reduction remaining to reach 20%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$65,000,000.00</td>
<td>-$12,291,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reductions thus far =18.9%</th>
<th>$709,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13-FY14 OIT Personnel Reductions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITC also reviewed administrative email use guidelines which are being put out for review to stakeholders and governance groups for input.

The ITC also reviewed and approved the IT Risk Management Plan.

In upcoming meetings, the ITC will review and address a backlog of IT projects and tasks for prioritization and action. It will also develop and disseminate guidelines and intake process for when IT projects need to be reviewed by the system wide IT Governance group.

Communications:
All IT Council meetings, actions and information will be located on our website at:

http://alaska.edu/oit/itgovernance/

Attachments:

IT Council Charter
IT Cost Reduction Recommendations
University of Alaska
Information Technology Council (ITC) Charter

**Purpose:** The Information Technology Council (ITC) is a standing body within the University of Alaska created to establish IT policy and administrative and operational standards, to analyze and set priorities for investment in information technology initiatives, and to ensure excellence and best practice in implementation in a way that directly supports UA mission attainment. The ITC is responsible for defining level 2 and level 3 governance committees, establishing the procedures and standards by which they operate, and will be accountable for the work of those groups in accordance with policies, practices, and standards.

The ITC will establish and cultivate Enterprise Architecture strategies throughout the organization and specify priority, supported and best-practice architectures throughout system establishing measures as needed to ensure a common strategy.

The ITC will advise the University of Alaska (UA) President and Summit Team and is charged to consider, decide and/or recommend strategic or operationally significant matters relating to shared and potentially shared Information Technology, according to the policies and processes of the University of Alaska. It is responsible for overseeing the analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of designated UA shared IT services in facilitation of the UA Mission.

**Guiding Principles:** The ITC will be distinguished as a collaborative, student-focused group with transparency and consultation across all its members; planning for matters such as relevant Cabinet, Summit or Board agendas; identification of responsible individuals to undertake tasks agreed to by the Council; and other work products of the Council.

The ITC will engage with other UA Executive Councils and business and academic leaders in support of all service initiatives. The ITC will ensure strategic alignment of IT initiatives, appropriate allocation of UA resources as to avoid unnecessary duplication, and mission-focused outcomes that allow strategic mission differentiation when necessary.

**Values:** The ITC will embody the values of being: student and mission focused, data-driven, transparent, inclusive, collaborative, timely, responsive, service oriented and respectful.

**Membership:** Membership comprises the UA Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO), who as the accountable executive, will chair the council, the three Information Resource Directors of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Anchorage and Southeast, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Human Resources Officer, Vice-President for Planning, Budget and Strategy, Chief Student Services Officer, a Provost, a Vice-Chancellor of Administration, a Vice Chancellor for Student Services, an eLearning Director, a Community Campus Director, and one representative each of student, staff and faculty governance.

The ITC shall appoint other ex-officio members as needed.

**Objectives:**

- Review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning new policies or implementation of policies relating to technology in support of the UA Mission;
- Establish and measure key performance indicators;
- Advise and guide the UA Administration and Board on technology opportunities and risks;
• Ensure the effective and efficient use of IT in enabling the University to achieve its goals;
• Provide consistent and comprehensive UA technology leadership that is aligned with the strategic priorities and mission of the University of Alaska;
• Support the appropriate agenda and preparation for the UA Board of Regents as requested by the UA Administration;
• Establish and maintain processes/procedures that ensure individual institutions are appropriately consulted, represented, informed, accountable and/or responsible regarding the planning, deployment and operations of system-wide technology;
• Establish and follow mechanisms for shared services that are well-articulated, transparent and equitable for all institutions;
• Establish procedures and measures to monitor adherence to decisions and policies (compliance and assurance);
• Ensure that processes, behaviors, and procedures are in accordance with policies and within risk tolerances to support decisions;
• Facilitate efficiency and effectiveness through System-wide collaboration and the provision of technology shared services, while allowing for institutional academic differentiation
• Ensure practices that successfully evaluate, select and execute implementation of system-wide technology solutions.

Committees
• The ITC will identify and establish Level 2 standing committees and Level 3 task forces to be formed and retired as deemed appropriate by the ITC.
  o An example of a Level 2 Committee is a standing committee focused on Enterprise Applications, Instructional Technologies or Security. An example of a Level 3 Committee is a short-term, focused Task Force to study, make recommendations and possibly implement a specific technology solution, project or problem such as a new parking application, new learning management system or specific upgrade to an existing solution.
• Each ITC member also serve on a Level 2 committee.
• ITC Level 2 committees will be formed including members from throughout the campus community.

Membership Structure/Roles: Decision-making will be by majority vote of ITC members. Decisions may be elevated to the President, in which case decisions will be made at that level.

Role of the Chair
The Chair is responsible for convening the ITC and its meeting logistics, agenda creation and triage. The Chair actively promotes the collaborative nature of the group and ensuring that, to the fullest extent possible, items of collective interest are shared in a timely fashion so as to permit thoughtful consideration of potential actions and advice from other members and the institutions they represent. The Council Chair serves as initial point of contact for the UA System Office and the Board of Regents.

Meeting Procedures
To be established at first meeting of the ITC, however, it is expected that the ITC will conduct regular meetings on a monthly basis.

All ITC Members’ Responsibilities
Each member of ITC will be expected to:
• Attend and actively participate
• Chair or sponsor a Level 2 committee or Level 3 task force
• Conduct appropriate background research
• Participate in the IT strategic planning process
IT Cost Savings Initiatives

Category 1: Projects Relatively Easy to Do. Will proceed with implementation and report back.

1. Telecommunications Initiatives
   a. Toll bypass and Tail end hop-off- Estimated Savings $120,000 per year
   b. UA wide long distance rates - Estimated Savings $24,000 per year
   c. Seek lower cost options for audio conferencing - Estimated Savings $100,000 per year
   d. Reduce / renegotiate cell-phone contracts ($100k total cost) - Estimated Savings $10,000 per year
   e. Acquire Lower 48 SIP trunk to eliminate long distance charges to Lower 48 - Estimated Savings $60,000 per year
   f. Acquire Nationwide calling Plan for UA based on SIP trunk service

2. Review Chariot Group contract/terms and consider RFP - Estimated Savings $188,000 per year (10%)

3. Reduce "embedded" IT staff - Estimated Savings $1,000,000 - $2,000,000 per year

4. Renegotiate Software Licensing and Maintenance - Estimated Savings $500,000 per year

Category 2: Projects that will take more investigation into actually expenses and more accurate savings. Will take 6-8 months to complete investigation and report back.

1. Copiers and printers move to fewer, multi function devices on service contracts - Estimated Savings $80,000 per year

2. Cloud versus VM for generic server services for depts? Estimated Savings $50,000 per year

3. Migrate to open source course management systems and office software - Estimated Savings $400,000 per year

4. Expedite two way banner interfaces (eliminate data rekey) Estimated Savings $500,000 per year

5. Continue to examine options for reducing network costs. Estimated Savings $500,000 per year

Category 3: Projects that will be difficult due to political, cultural, or personal nature of change. Will require IT Council consideration and recommendations.

1. Limit the number of macs purchased - Estimated Savings $400,000 per year

2. Do no more video conferencing - Estimated Savings $849,000 per year
Statewide Council on Research
Charter

Members
Miles Baker, Assoc. Vice President, Government Relations, SW
Myron Dosch, Chief Financial Officer, UA
Susan Henrichs, Provost, UAF
Larry Hinzman, Vice Chancellor Research, UAF (chair)
Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, OGCA, UAF
Paula Martin, Vice Provost Research, UAS
Anupma Prakash, Director, EPSCoR
Helena Wisniewski, Vice Provost Research, UAA

Mission
The systemwide Council on Research will advance UA's research capacity by advocating for research infrastructure, innovation, entrepreneurship, and strategic partnerships, and by empowering researchers to obtain and manage extramural funding.

Scope
The Council will work to support UA research that is value-added, responsive, and relevant to the needs of the State of Alaska and the world. The Council will foster research to diversify and grow Alaska's economy, to build resilient communities, and to position Alaska as a world leader in high-latitude studies.

Role of the Research Council
The Council shall serve as an advisory body for the three UA chancellors. The Council shall be responsible for the coordination of inter-institutional relations to promote and leverage emerging research opportunities. The council shall build an inclusive, transparent, and efficient research environment that will enable researchers to write competitive proposals and carry out successful research projects.

Goals of the Research Council
1. Provide strategic vision and investment priorities for research.
2. Develop an implementation plan relevant to Strategic Pathways Phase 1 goals for research administration.
3. Highlight systemwide research expertise and synthesize key accomplishments for communicating to external constituents.
4. Serve as an information conduit for legislators, agencies, and potential collaborators.

Meeting and Reporting
The Council will initially meet once a month and then determine the frequency of future meetings after one year.
The Council will report to the Summit Team, and will also seek input from the Summit Team as appropriate.

**Plan for interaction with other councils:**
The Council shall interact primarily and frequently with the UA Academic, Business, and Institutional Research councils. It is anticipated that collaboration will also be needed with the councils of Information Technology, Human Resources and Student Services to address common interests.

**Communication plan:**
The Council will communicate regularly with the Summit Team and will present an overall plan for Council activities to the UA President in October 2017. This plan will expand on the Council charter and incorporate procedures for external communications, including collating information suitable for the UA Board of Regents, the Alaska Legislature, and a wider national and international audience.
Statewide Council on Research
Charter

Members
Miles Baker, Assoc. Vice President, Government Relations, SW
Myron Dosch, Chief Financial Officer, UA
Susan Henrichs, Provost, UAF
Larry Hinzman, Vice Chancellor Research, UAF (chair)
Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, OGCA, UAF
Paula Martin, Vice Provost Research, UAS
Anupma Prakash, Director, EPSCoR
Helena Wisniewski, Vice Provost Research, UAA

Member update to the UA Summit Team

The System-wide Council on Research have met twice since our establishment; both meetings were focused upon discussions of our role and purpose, which we attempted to articulate in our Charter. Preliminary discussions involved exploring the actions required for effective research administration. The comprehensive discussion of administrative functions was parsed according to those duties that both share common concerns across all Alaska universities and would benefit from jointly addressing those topics.

Our charter was created through discussion and collaborative revisions. It remains as a strategic document that will be continually updated as needed.

The SW Council on Research will meet on a monthly basis. Future topics of discussion include:

- Demonstrating the value of research to Alaskan citizens and legislators
- Promoting joint use of research facilities to maximize productivity and efficiency

Our next scheduled meeting will be September 13, 2:00pm.
Memorandum

Date: September 08, 2017
To: President Johnsen
From: Saichi Oba, AVP

Subject: Student Services Council Charter and Strategic Pathways update.

On the following pages please find the Student Services Charter and the Student Services Strategic Pathways update.

Encl.

Cc Dr. Bruce Shultz, VCSA, UAA
     Dr. Gary Gray, VCSA, UAF
     Joe Nelson, VCSA, UAS
     Evon Peter, VCCRCD, UAF
     Mary Gower, Chief Title IX Officer, UA
     Lael Oldmixon, Director UA Scholars / UA CSP
Student Services Council Charter
As of August 24, 2017

Mission: The mission of the UA Student Services Council (SSC) is to foster a student centric experience through the collaborative development and periodic review of university policies, programs, and practices. The SSC will provide recommendations to UA leadership including the President, Board of Regents, Summit Team, Academic Council and other councils.

Scope: System-wide student services functions including the development and periodic review of policies, programs and processes.

Reporting: Through the chair, the SSC will report decisions made through consensus and recommendations of the SSC regularly to other councils, the President, and the Board Regents.

Chair: AVP, Student Enrollment Strategies, Statewide - Saichi Oba

Members:
VC, Students, UAA - Bruce Schultz
VC, Students, UAF - TBD
VC, Students, UAS - Joe Nelson
Chief Title IX, Statewide - Mary Gower
Director, UA College Savings Plan, Statewide - Lael Oldmixon
VC, CRCD, UAF - Evon Peter

Meeting Schedule: First meeting July 27, 2017 from 3 - 4 pm
4th Thursday of the month via telephone and/or video
Face-to-face meetings twice annually

Goals: From Attachment D of President Johnsen’s memo on system-wide councils, on Strategic Pathways directions:

- Pursue consolidation of tasks among the universities and Statewide by formalizing and empowering the Student Services Council to propose what “back room” functions (with potential focus on registration and financial aid) should be consolidated, standardized, simplified, and automated to free up resources to improve the student experience and recruitment, retention, and completion.

- Formal incorporation of the University Strategic Enrollment Group (USEG) as a subgroup of the SSC.

Plan for interaction with other councils: Interaction / collaboration with Academic, Institutional Research, Information Technology, and Community Campus Directors and other councils as needed or as issues arise.

Communication plan: Share monthly agenda items with system-wide councils as needed. Communicate council’s decisions and plans for initiatives to Summit Team & other system-wide councils.
“Pursue Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide by formalizing and empowering the Student Services Council to propose what “back room” functions (with potential focus on registration and financial aid) should be consolidated and standardized, simplified, and automated to free up resources to improve the student experience and recruitment, retention, and completion.”

Financial Aid

Deanna Dieringer, Director of Financial Aid, UAF
Sonya Stein, Director of Financial Aid, UAA
Allison Bakumenko, Financial Aid Technical Analyst, UAA
Janelle Cook, Director of Financial Aid, UAS

In general, the offices of financial aid across UA already conduct business in the same manner because most financial aid programs are heavily regulated by federal and/or state statute.

In addition, those process or procedures not already governed by federal or state mandates reflect specific academic or institutional policies. An example of such individual policies can be found in the Return of Title IV funds.

A university is obligated to return Title IV funds (commonly referred to as R2T4) if a student fails to complete all courses that he/she enrolls in for the semester. In order to calculate exactly how much must be returned, the financial aid office needs to know when the student last attended each course they were enrolled in. The faculty of the course would need to enter or supply this information to avoid returning a significant portion of the student’s aid. Currently, the students last date of attendance is not uniformly captured by all universities.

- UAA requires faculty to provide a last date of attendance for students who do not complete the course.
- UAS records the last date of attendance if the student receives an F, or NB - No-Basis (not if for a W - Withdraw).
- UAF is planning to implement the requirement in the fall of 2017 for all of the "non-completion" grade types (W - Withdraw, I - Incomplete, NB - No Basis, & F).

In some cases the universities approach or process are driven by philosophical differences. An example of these disparate philosophies can be seen in how the universities develop cost of attendance budgets. These budgets are used to help
students and families gain a better understanding of the total costs of attendance - not simply tuition and fees at the universities.

Each university presents attendance costs based on student level - i.e. undergraduate and graduate. UAA and UAF further delineate undergraduate costs between lower division and upper division; UAS does not.

Each university also includes cost estimates dependent on living location. UAS uses only two categories: living on-campus or living off-campus; UAA and UAF use on- and off-campus and also includes a third category: ‘with parents’ (for UAF the cost estimates for room and board do not change whether a student is living on-campus or off-campus however if ‘with parents’ the estimate does not include room or rental costs).

The universities all use the same categories of residency: Alaska resident, non-resident and Western Undergraduate Exchange and provide costs estimates accordingly.

The results are variations of overall total costs of attendance for each university. Below are cost estimates for full-time, Alaska resident undergrad, living off campus, at each of the Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAA</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>UAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Attendance for a full-time student who is living off-campus taking 24 undergraduate, lower division (100-200) credits and is a(n) Alaska resident.</td>
<td>Living Arrangement</td>
<td>Off Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (24 crs)</td>
<td>$4,848</td>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>$1,338</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and supplies</td>
<td>$1,608</td>
<td>Student/Course Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>$9,134</td>
<td>Personal/Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>$2,594</td>
<td>Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$1,998</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/misc.</td>
<td>$5,570</td>
<td>Tuition (24 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$27,090</td>
<td>Total Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Financial Aid directors did identify several areas where further discussion on policy alignment could lead to process alignment and perhaps even centralization. The list includes:

- Student Verification (part of the FAFSA process for some students)
- Gainful Employment Reporting
- Certifying VA Benefits
- Total Cost of Attendance Budgets
- Degree audit
- Academic year set-up

**Next steps**

In addition to reviewing the list above, the directors suggested SW help locate examples of other public university systems that may have centralized or consolidated some or all of the financial aid functions and arrange for the Fin Aid Directors to discuss with such institutions their experiences, the pros, cons and lessons learned.

Additionally a consultant, someone with technical Banner experience from outside UA, could help provide suggestions on ways to collaborate and create efficiencies that we do not easily recognize.

While there is a need to engage in quality 'brainstorming', we have to recognized this requires time and capacity - both in short supply right now. The directors (and many UA faculty and staff) are in a Catch-22, we are asking them to brainstorm so they can come up with ways to be more efficient but they are in an environment that is operating at or near at capacity and they don’t have the time to brainstorm.

Finally, a rather poignant comment from one of the directors seemed to sum up the discussions quite well “it is hard for me to think outside this box because I have been in the box for so long - but can’t help but think there is a better way to do this business…”

Registration

Barbara Hegel, Registrar, UAS
Lindsey Chadwell, Interim Registrar, UAA
Lora Volden, Interim AVC, UAA
Michael Earnest, Registrar, UAF
Unlike financial aid, the policies surrounding the work of the Registrars and their staffs are for the most part not federally mandated (FERPA of course is a major exception) but rather reflect the academic and institutional policies of their respective universities.

As with the Financial Aid directors, the Registrars support greater policy alignment - which would then lead to process alignment.

The list of areas in which policy alignment could be recommended include:

- Grading
  - Use of ‘+’, ‘-’
  - Incompletes
  - Deferred grades
- Last Date of Attendance (Financial Aid also mentioned this)
- Admission Deadlines
- Fee Payment Deadlines (Financial Aid also mentioned this)
- Calculating cost of attendance budgets (Financial Aid also mentioned this)
- Exceptions to policies (differing practices)
- Residency requirements for tuition exceptions (differing practices)
- Active status (how long before catalog expires?)
- Expired applications for admissions
- Academic standing / Reinstatement
- Academic Bankruptcy
- When the academic year starts
- Drop for non-payment
- Summer term alignment
- Common Course numbering

Discussions about greater alignment and collaboration have gone on for years between the Registrars, staffs across the campuses and Statewide. I was reminded that in 2008 and again in 2013 a memo suggesting greater collaboration between the universities was shared with the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. I was able to locate a copy of the memo and have included the contents below. Many of the items identified in 2008 have been acted upon and implemented.

**Next steps**

The Registrars have suggested that further policy work will necessitate involving academic affairs, student affairs and in some cases information technology and financial
services (this same recommendation was made in the 2008 memo.)

The Registrars have also boldly offered two items that could profoundly change the student experience at UA: eliminate the need to transfer courses between UA campuses - meaning a course taken at one UA campus is credit earned at any UA campus.

Additionally, even if policies can be fully aligned, we may be approaching the limitations of our current ERP (Banner) to serve students in light of the expectations many now arrive with having grown accustomed to Amazon, Google and Netflix and while replacing an ERP is an enormous task, the Registrars are openly asking if it is time to visit the question of whether or not to replace Banner.

Contents from the memo to the UA VPAA, dated January 8, 2008:

Recall this past fall during your address of the UA Banner Student User’s at their annual meeting; you asked the group “what could you do as the VPAA to help them?”

Over the proceeding months these same users responded with a document (see attached) offering their perspective on areas of alignment that would help staff better serve students. It is important to note: these recommendations are from staff at the campus, who help students every day with daily transactions – moments of truth – in which their ability to efficiently serve their students is often challenged because of business process that reflect artificial boundaries rather than student centered practices.

The recommendations cut across boundaries – student services, academic affairs and information technology. My sense is a joint meeting with the three councils (SAC, SSC and ITC) should be called so that these groups can begin to discuss these suggestions.

I have shared this document with you and the Student Services Council (SSC) previously – and per your request have now added this cover memo.

Thank you.

Proposed areas of alignment between MAUs
January 2008
Banner Student Team

1) Academic disqualification & Reinstatement
2) Grading

3) Course delivery system
   *Update: All universities are using Blackboard.*

4) One email service
   *Update: All universities have access to Google Mail.*

5) Common Calendar
   *Update: UA implemented a common calendar in 2016.*

6) Common Course Numbering

7) Common Placement Testing
   *Update: all Universities use Accuplacer for English/Writing course placement and ALEKS for math course placement.*
September 11, 2017

TO: Jim Johnsen, UA President

FROM: Michelle Rizk, VP University Relations

RE: University Relations Council Report

The University Relations Council has met twice since its creation, on July 19 and August 21, and will continue to meet monthly during approximately the third week of each month.

Charter
A copy of the council’s draft charter, with appendix, is attached for your review.

Strategic Pathways Update

1. The council was directed to conduct a communications needs assessment to reduce redundancies, find opportunities for cost efficiency, and increase alignment throughout the system. The council is requesting an extension for this directive, as conducting the needs assessment requires significant time and planning in order to make the results as useful as possible. We expect to present the results of the needs assessment to you by mid-November. The framework for the needs assessment follows this memo for your review.

2. The council was also instructed to ensure that each university form its own Public Relations (PR) Council with representatives from key university centers, departments, community campuses, research institutes, and athletics. A document describing the make-up of each university’s PR council (with the exception of UAS, which does not have a formal council due to its small size) follows this memo for your review.
University Relations Council Charter
(Second draft – first draft reviewed by council 8/21/17; second draft revisions made 9/7/17)

Mission
The University Relations Council will:
- Facilitate alignment among university and statewide communications; share information among the universities and statewide.
- Provide advice to communication professionals and the Summit Team regarding communications.
- Explore and recommend ways to coordinate resources and communication projects to maximize effectiveness, increase efficiency and reduce cost.
- Provide input on communication-related policies, plans, strategies, programs and activities across the universities and statewide.

Scope
The University Relations Council will provide a critical voice in the development of an integrated and cohesive approach to systemwide communications and promotions to internal and external audiences. Functions such as strategic communications planning/messaging, including public/government relations and marketing, shall be the purview of this council. Additionally, the UR Council will endeavor to articulate to university leadership the communication needs of the universities/campuses and the system.

Reporting
- September 8 deadline to submit charter to President Johnsen, charter should include proposed language and understanding of goals
- October deadline to complete the communications needs assessment and present results to President Johnsen

Chair
- Michelle Rizk – VP University Relations, Statewide

Members
- AVP Public Affairs, Statewide – Robbie Graham
- AVC University Relations, UAA – Kristin DeSmith
- Director of University Relations, UAF – Michelle Renfrew
- Public Information Officer, UAS – Keni Campbell
- Dean of Community & Technical College, UAA – Denise Runge
- Dean of College of Liberal Arts, UAF – Todd Sherman
- Senior Public Information Officer, UAF – Marmian Grimes
- Director of Preparing Indigenous Teachers for Alaska Schools (PITAAS), UAS - Ronalda Cadiente-Brown
- Public Information Officer Council Representative, UAF – Meghan Murphy
- Athletics Representative from UAA – Ian Marks
- Public Relations & Marketing Manager, UAA - Kirstin Olmstead

Staff support: Chanda File, Administrative Assistant for SW University Relations/Public Affairs

Meeting Schedule
- Meetings will be held monthly via audio/video conference
- Future meeting times will be determined as needed
- Face-to-face meetings will be held twice annually

**Goals**
- From Attachment D (Strategic Pathways directions) of President Johnsen’s memo on systemwide councils:
  1. The UR Council will assess communication needs across all campuses and Statewide to reduce operational redundancies, pursue opportunities for cost efficiency, and increase alignment. Results of the needs assessment will be presented to the president in October.
  2. Each university will form a University PR Council with representatives from key university centers, departments, community campuses, research institutes, and athletics.

**Other Goals**
- Advise on system-wide council communications (Michelle Renfrew and Michelle Rizk leading)

**Plan for interaction with other councils**
- Interaction/collaboration with Development Council as necessary and with other councils as needed or as issues require

**Communication plan**
- Share monthly agenda items with other systemwide councils
- Communicate UR Council’s decisions and roll-out plans for initiatives to Summit Team & other systemwide councils
- Communicate with and seek feedback from university-level communications councils
Appendix

Appendix A: University Relations structures at each university and statewide:

**Statewide:** Statewide University Relations is led by a vice president of university relations (VP/UR).

Statewide University Relations includes public affairs, government relations and development (UA Foundation).

UA Office of Public Affairs is led by an associate vice president of public affairs, who reports to VP/UR and focuses on proactive communications, media/public relations, stakeholder and internal communications, social media, website management and crisis management at the system level. OPA also is charged with supporting the University of Alaska president and Board of Regents (see attached org chart for PA team structure) and developing a strategic communications plan for UA.

UA Government Relations is led by an associate vice president, who reports to VP/UR and handles state, federal and community relations including managing legislative needs.

UA Development is led by the president of the UA Foundation, who reports to the UA president and VP/UR.

**UAF:** UAF University Relations is led by a director of university relations, who reports directly to the chancellor.

University Relations is the public relations, communications and marketing arm of the advancement team, which also includes development, alumni relations and student affairs.

UA University Relations is led by an associate vice president, who reports to VP/UR and handles state, federal and community relations including managing legislative needs.

UA Development is led by the president of the UA Foundation, who reports to the UA president and VP/UR.

**UAA:** UAA University Relations is led by an associate vice chancellor for university relations, who reports to the vice chancellor for advancement.

UAA University Relations is the marketing/communications arm of the Advancement team, which also includes development and alumni relations.

UA University Relations is charged with supporting the overall institution’s internal and external communications and marketing, including media relations, social media, website management, brand management, crisis communications, reputation management and chancellor’s communications. In addition, UAA UR supports university events, fundraising, alumni and enrollment marketing efforts.

Some units and community campuses employ communications professionals or people who do communications work as a part of their jobs. Those positions do not report to UAA UR.

**UAS:** There is no formal university relations department at UAS. Marketing and public affairs are not formally linked and the public affairs function is an add-on to the duties of the chancellor’s executive assistant/PIO.

Marketing and communications function is done by specific units at UAS. There is a marketing manager for admissions [student recruitment] and a director who oversees alumni and development functions. The marketing manager reports to the Vice Chancellor of Student Enrollment and is not formally linked to the PIO.
The UAS PIO’s primary duties focus on supporting the Office of the Chancellor, with the added responsibilities of media relations and stakeholder communications.
NEEDS ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

1. ESTABLISHING THE PROTOCOL
   A. Define the goal[s] and rationale for the assessment
      i. Establish goals
      ii. Send memo to CFO/CHRO & chancellors outlining the process and asking chancellors to communicate to their respective deans/directors the expectations for their participation in the information gathering process
      iii. Draft letter to deans/directors that will inform them about upcoming interviews, virtual desk audit and materials collection process.
      iv. Share framework and areas of study for the data pull with the UR Council
      v. Hire contractor to assist with the following data collection.
      vi. After all data is collected and an initial analysis done, the UR Council will convene to evaluate.

2. DATA TO BE COLLECTED / TOOLS TO BE USED
   A. Personnel [FTE] Review:
      i. Through SW HR—ask for list of employees in Communications Professionals classification [communication specialists I-IV] / communication managers / executives] to determine base number of communicators. List will include name, email, title, FTE, unit, department, benefit rate and salary.
      ii. Campus UR will review information provided to determine if anyone is missing, and will add those names to spreadsheet.
      iii. Ask deans/directors to verify list and add any missing communications staff. (will establish guidelines for this, using tools list from work assessment as guideline)
      iv. Create a Survey Monkey virtual work assessment and distribute to final list of communications staff, which will determine the percentage of time spent on communications activities.

   B. Tools/Materials Review
      i. Create a list of tools and materials encompassing tools like social media accounts and materials like brochures and pens in order to have a uniform list of items.
ii. Interview deans/directors, asking them to identify (to the best of their abilities) which tools and materials are being used by their unit and the targeted audience. These interviews could take place with PIOs or other employee designated by the dean/director.

C. **Budget Analysis**

   i. Create list of account codes that encompasses all communications related expenditures

   ii. SW CFO [or team] will pull budgets for FY16 and FY17 for the listed account codes, separated by unit into “restricted” and “non-restricted” funding categories

   iii. Result should show the costs associated with communication tasks by the two fiscal years across all campuses and Statewide.
University PR Council Structures

**UAA**

- **Campus Communicators Group**

  **Function:** The function of the group is to build a strong network of UAA campus communicators who work together to share our Amazing Stories.
  
  **Meeting Time:** 2-3 p.m., first Friday of the month | **Location** (varies): Administration Building, Room 102

**Members:**

Paola Banchero, Pbanchero@alaska.edu
Journalism & Communication Department Associate Professor

Asia Bauzon, ambauzon@alaska.edu
College of Arts & Sciences – Division of Performing & Fine Arts Communications Specialist

Katie Behnke, klbehnke@alaska.edu
College of Arts & Sciences Lead Social Media/Communications Specialist

Ruth Cardoso, rcardoso2@alaska.edu
Parking Services

Luis Chavez, lchavezjr@alaska.edu
College of Arts & Sciences – Mathematics & Natural Sciences Social Media & Graduate

Brittani Chu, bpchu@alaska.edu
eLearning

Zac Clark, mzclark@alaska.edu
Student Life & Leadership Concert Board and Programs Coordinator

Rebecca Coffin, rhcoffin@alaska.edu
College of Arts & Sciences – Humanities Student Support

Pam Cravez, pcravez@alaska.edu
Justice Center Editor, Alaska Justice Forum

Kim Eames, kkeames@alaska.edu
College of Arts & Sciences - Creative Writing and Literary Arts Assistant

Terrie Gottstein, tggottstein@alaska.edu
College of Engineering Special Projects Officer
TBD Pending New Hire
Student Affairs Community Outreach Coordinator

TBD Pending New Hire
Center for Community Engagement & Learning

Sara Juday, sjuday@alaska.edu
Institutional Effectiveness, Engagement, and Academic Support Writer/Editor

Malla Kukkonen, mmkukkonen@alaska.edu
Arctic Domain Awareness Center (ADAC) Administrative and Communications Officer

Isabel Mead, ivmead@alaska.edu
Campus Bookstore Assistant Technology Buyer

Brandon Moore, bsmoore@alaska.edu
Business Services Marketing Director

Rebekah Moras, rebekah@alaskachd.org
Center for Human Development Research Professional

Shayne Nuesca, smnuesca@alaska.edu
Student Outreach and Transition Social Media Assistant

Alex Olah, alex@alaskachd.org
Center for Human Development Research Professional

Molly Orheim, mdorheim@alaska.edu
Career Exploration & Services Director

Nate Sagan, nssagan@alaska.edu
Seawolf Athletics Assistant Athletic Director for Media Relations

Liz Shine, eashine@alaska.edu
Student Outreach and Transition Marketing & Creative Design Coordinator

Omega Smith, osmith11@alaska.edu
UAA Planetarium Manager

Stacy Smith, slsmith@alaska.edu
College of Health Editor

Bob Stott, rgstottjr@alaska.edu
College of Business & Public Policy Information and Communication Systems Director
- **Social Media Managers Group**
  Campus-wide group, meets every other month for “TalkSocial” brown bags.

---

**UAF**

- **Public Information Officers Council**
  The PIOC is made up of public information officers/communicators throughout UAF.

  **Function:** The council functions, roughly, as an extension of the University Relations team and works collaboratively on several projects, including a weekly feature story rotation, a centralized news releases distribution process, the UAF experts guide and the UAF centennial PR committee. The PIOC also provides feedback on major campus initiatives, as needed, helps staff the UAF incident management team’s public information function and provides the framework for initiating new cross-unit communications initiatives.

  **Meeting times:** The team has regular monthly meetings, as well as two retreats each year: A half day in the summer for input on the UAF communication plan and a full day in the winter for yearly tactical and strategic planning.

  **Members:**
  - Nancy Tarnai, KUAC
  - Debbie Carter, School of Natural Resources and Extension
  - Tammy Tragis-McCook, School of Management
  - Andrea Miller, School of Management
  - Theresa Bakker, UA Museum of the North
  - Suzanne Bishop, Rasmuson Library
  - Meghan Murphy, College of Natural Science and Mathematics
  - Leona Long, College of Rural and Community Development
  - Tina Buxbaum, Alaska Center for Climate Assessment and Policy
  - Melody Cavanaugh Moen, Alaske Center for Energy and Power
  - Tania Clucas, Alaska EPSCoR
  - Marissa Carl, UAF eLearning
  - Karalee Watts, UAF Community and Technical College
  - Sue Mitchell, Geophysical Institute
  - Nona Letuligasenoa, Alaska Nanooks
  - Lauren Frisch, College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences
  - Nate Bauer, International Arctic Research Center
  - Paula Dobbyn, Alaska Sea Grant
  - Sonnary Campbell, Institute of Arctic Biology
  - Jeff Richardson, University Relations
  - Andrew Cassel, University Relations

---

**UAS:**

UAS does not have a formal campus PR council. Keni Campbell, public information officer, meets informally with UAS’ marketing/web office housed under Enrollment Management.