



UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA

Many Traditions One Alaska

Strategic Pathways

Board of Regents
September 14, 2017

Strategic Pathways

How do we meet Alaska's needs for higher education with fewer resources from the state?

Strategic Pathways

Rev: Summer 2017

How do we optimize our statewide system to achieve our goals for higher education in Alaska?

OUR MISSION		“The University of Alaska inspires learning, and advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research, and public service, emphasizing the North and its diverse peoples.” (Regents' Policy 01.01.01)		
OBJECTIVE		Maximize value to Alaska through excellent, accessible, and cost effective higher education funded by diverse and growing revenue sources		
CORE PRINCIPLES		Focus, Access, Diversity, Excellence, Consistency, Fiscal Sustainability		
STRATEGY		Prepare, Restructure, Implement, Refine		
WHO WE ARE		UA ANCHORAGE Comprehensive metropolitan university in Alaska’s economic hub, with primary focus on workforce development through its several regional community campuses	UA FAIRBANKS Research university renowned for leadership in Arctic and the North, with additional focus on workforce development and community and rural education	UA SOUTHEAST Comprehensive regional university focused on interdisciplinary & marine-oriented programs, teacher education, e-Learning, and workforce development
CAMPUS LEAD FOR THE STATE*	Research	Social and economic sciences, health	Arctic science and policy, physical, biological, and social sciences, engineering and applied energy	Interdisciplinary / environmental
	Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health professions • Business and public policy • Economics • Logistics • Project Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical, natural, and related sciences • Arctic / Northern Studies • Rural development / tribal management • Doctoral education • Mine training • Fisheries and ocean sciences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine-oriented programs (including joint programs with UAF) • Teacher education (administration) • Interdisciplinary degrees/ degree completion • Emphasis on regional workforce priorities, e.g., mine training.
	Outreach	• Aligned with Research and Teaching Focus		
COURSES / PROGRAMS AVAILABLE ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common General Education Requirements • Liberal Arts and Humanities • Social Sciences & Natural Sciences • Nursing • Engineering • Distance Education / E-Learning • Career and Technical Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alaska Native Studies • Teacher Education • Management • Mine training • Wide choice of non-major courses • Dual credit with K-12 • Developmental Education 	

* Research, teaching, and outreach at campuses other than the “lead” campus that are of high quality, cost effective, and core to mission, will continue to be provided.

Strategic Pathways

Strategic Pathways is a transparent and inclusive process of discovery. How do we organize our university system in order to maximize the value we provide to our students and our state, while our revenues are under such severe pressure? 230 faculty, staff, students, and community leaders have come together from across Alaska to strengthen UA in terms of:

1. **Cost effectiveness** in all we do – important, but not the sole factor
2. **Quality** of the academic program or administrative service
3. **Access** to the benefits of the program/service to students, faculty, staff, and community
4. **Community impact** on the local, regional, statewide, and broader communities we serve
5. **Fiscal sustainability** over the long term

Strategic Pathways

Phase 1

Decisions have been made either by management or the Board of Regents in all seven areas reviewed. Implementation is in planning or under way in these areas:

Engineering, Teacher Education, Management, Information Technology, Athletics, Research Administration, Procurement

Phase 2

Options were discussed with stakeholders and campus communities; recommendations were shared with the Board at the June meeting. Implementation is in planning or under way in all eight areas:

Community Campuses, E-Learning, Fisheries, Health, Human Resources, Student Services, Institutional Research, University Relations

Phase 3

Options were shared with the Board of Regents for the seven areas in June. The first round of forums were held at each campus and I will share my initial thoughts with the Board at the September meeting for:

Arts and Humanities, Social and Natural Sciences, Mine Training, Finance, Land Management, Risk Management, Facilities

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Timeline

- ✓ Design process, solicit team members, and select teams (Dec.)
- ✓ Meeting 1 (Jan. 30-31)
 - ✓ Review charge, scope and goals of the team
 - ✓ Discuss interests, standards, benchmarks
 - ✓ Generate options, outline pros/cons
 - ✓ Update community
- ✓ Meeting 2 (Feb. 27-28)
 - ✓ Discuss pros/cons of options from Meeting 1
 - ✓ Evaluate options in relation to interests and standards
 - ✓ Identify most viable options for presentation to Summit Team
 - ✓ Update community
- ✓ Teams present to UA President and Summit Team (April 11)
- ✓ UA President receives feedback (April 11 – June 1 and ongoing)
- ✓ UA President will present options to the Board of Regents (June 1-2)
- ✓ UA President shares initial thoughts with Board of Regents (Sept.)
- ☐ UA President provides recommendations to Board of Regents (Nov.)

Strategic Pathways Phase 3 Initial Thoughts

<http://alaska.edu/pathways/phase-3/>

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Arts & Humanities	<p><u>Charge</u>: Weigh the options of pursuing collaborative opportunities including but not limited to common course numbering, common catalogue, course sharing, common curriculum committees.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: UAA College of Arts and Sciences, UAS School of Arts and Sciences, UAF College of Liberal Arts</p>	Achieve better coordination and leveraging between the campuses to improve UA student success and potential cost savings



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Arts & Humanities

Actions (as suggested in the team report):

	1. Common Course Numbering	2. Common Public Accessible Degree Portal	3. DegreeWorks - Upgrade to Include Course Equivalency
Pros	Greater collaboration across system; simplifies student transfers; increase community understanding of options	Potential students/the public see what each program/degree offers at each campus	Simplify student transfers between campuses; students are familiar with program; high potential to increase student success and timely degree completion
Cons	Would require starting a new system from scratch (while still maintaining the old); time consuming; expensive process	Complex system requiring coordination and regular maintenance; need dedicated marketing/OIT staff; implementation time unclear and costs unknown	Complex system requiring coordination and regular maintenance; implementation time unclear and costs unknown; would require culture shift for campuses to “share” students
	4. Course Sharing Across Universities	5. Disciplinary Coordinating Teams	6. Strengthen and Expand Support for High-Impact Teaching Practices
Pros	Already being piloted in several programs; increase accessibility and enrollment in upper division courses; cost savings; possibly attract non-traditional students	Prerequisite to move to a transfer system like the WICHE Passport; fundamental groundwork to collaborative options; enables implementation of options 2-4	Proven to increase student success, degree completion and retention; variety of practice options available for student and faculty; supports needs of non-traditional students
Cons	Lack of facilitates/technology; needs a common calendar; increased faculty time dedicated to developing & teaching course; needs resources to be realized	Time consuming; impact on faculty team member service load; wide variance in implementation	Increased resource needs for development and faculty training; requires flexibility in scheduling; would need institutional support/commitment

Initial Thoughts: Build on GER alignment progress to align larger, common majors (leaving room for individual, unique courses); Adopt Option 5, support establishment of Communities of Practice in order to pursue options 2-4 and others; Adopt Option 6.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Social and Natural Sciences	<p><u>Charge</u>: Weigh the options of pursuing collaborative opportunities including but not limited to common course numbering, common catalogue, course sharing, common curriculum committees.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: UAA College of Arts and Sciences, UAS School of Arts and Sciences, UAF College of Liberal Arts, UAF College of Natural Sciences and Math (Math)</p>	Achieve better coordination and leveraging between the campuses to improve UA student success and potential cost savings



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Social and Natural Sciences

Options:

	1. Common Course Numbering	2. Common Catalogue	3. Course Sharing	4. Common Curriculum Committees
Pros	Already started for many GERs; could improve consistency of Student Learning outcomes; ease transfer for students from outside of Alaska	Single portal for university offerings; may increase ease of access for potential students	Increased collaboration; increased options for students; help student retention; cost savings; builds on existing experiences	None offered
Cons	High cost/low return on student success; requires cost resources; time consuming; pressure to reduce course expectation to lowest common denominator	Scope & scale not defined; redundancy with existing resources; create confusion between distinct degree programs; time consuming	Potential for intercampus competition for students; requires significant collaboration; time consuming; cost resources required	Less responsive to changing needs; homogenization of programs; delays course offerings; high costs and increased faculty workload
	5. Faculty and Student Intrastate Mobility (Study Alaska)	6. Share High Impact Practices Across Universities	7. Expand and Enhance the Advising Process	
Pros	Like Study Abroad program; allows for credit transfers; benefit rural and Indigenous students; increased enrollment, retention, and campus collaboration	Proven to increase student success, degree completion and retention; high quality programs raise U profile; generally supported by faculty and students	Ease class transfers; increased student success, retention and completion rate; better student preparation for after graduation; system collaboration leads to building online resources	
Cons	Unknown upfront costs; housing arrangements may be challenging; time consuming to start	Cost; time consuming; significant faculty development needed; may require curricular changes	Potential duplication of effort; requires commitment to address inconsistencies in current advising practice	

Initial Thoughts: Adopt similar steps as in Arts and Humanities, and support Option 5 and 7.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Mine Training	<p><u>Charge</u>: Weigh all options for delivery of mine training across campuses and sites, to include the possibility of a lead university/campus coordinating statewide programs and activities.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: MAPTS, UAS Center for Mine training</p>	Determine the optimal delivery of mine training across the system



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Mine Training

Options:

	1. One UA Lead Institution for Mine Training at UAF	2. One UA Lead Institution for Mine Training at UAS	3. UA System Does Not Offer Mine Training	4. Enhance Existing Structure
Pros	Potential administrative efficiency; opportunities for new grant funding and training; unified mission & goals; single point of entry	Potential administrative efficiency; opportunities for new grant funding and training; unified mission & goals; single point of entry	Immense cost savings	Least disruptive; unified and aligned mission, vision, goal; increased tuition revenue; increased options for students
Cons	Potential for confusion & disruptive; accreditation complications; implementation costs; no perceived ROI	Potential for confusion & disruptive; implementation costs; potential loss of MAPTS; no perceived ROI	Potential lack of training opportunities in AK; increased out of state hires; negative impact on UA/Foundation; loss of industry education tax credit	Cost of implementation; potential disruption to current practice; potential perception of unwillingness to change

Initial Thoughts: Option 4, enhance current structure, working well.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Finance	<p><u>Charge</u>: Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one campus, or consolidation at SW of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through outsourcing, automation, intercampus collaboration, process standardization, and other means TBD by the team.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: All Finance functions</p>	Optimize resources and align with UA priorities



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Finance

Options:

	1. Fully Decentralized Finance	2. Consolidate Finance at One (Lead) Campus	3. Consolidate Finance at Statewide	4. Strategic Finance for UA: Reorganize, Automate, Outsource, Streamline and Implement Shared Services
Pros	Responsive to campus needs; increases opportunities to find efficiencies; timely decision making; empowers regional/community support	Political support for selected campus; standardized practices; system cost savings possible; compliance; increased collaboration & innovation/adaptation	Legislative audit support for efficiency; standardized practices; system cost savings possible; compliance; increased collaboration & innovation/adaptation	Customized for solutions for each process; allows for consolidation; facilitates collaboration; long term sustainability; promotes cost effective practices & outsourcing
Cons	Expensive; multiple IT instances; potential for inconsistencies; increased audit scrutiny; multiple processes	Lack of political support for non-selected campuses; potential bottlenecks; time consuming; staff displacement; needs of lead campus only met; shadow functions emerge	Departure from SW admin/policy function; lack of support from faculty/staff; time consuming; potential favoritism by SW to one campus; shadow functions emerge	Time consuming and may be difficult to coordinate; no support/buy in; initially cost expensive; technology upgrades needed; complex and potentially difficult to communicate

Initial Thoughts: Option 4. Charge UA Business Council to pursue process and policy simplification, improvement, and automation. Examine pros and cons of simplifying chart of accounts.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Land Management	<p><u>Charge</u>: Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one campus, or consolidation at SW of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through outsourcing, automation, intercampus collaboration, process standardization, and other means TBD by the team.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: All Land Management functions</p>	Optimize resources and align with UA priorities



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Land Management

Options:

	1. Status Quo	2. Decentralized Authority for Educational Properties	3a. Outsource Property Management and Non-Revenue Services for Investment Properties	3b. Outsource Property Management and Non-Revenue Services for Educational Properties
Pros	Avoids disruption; maintains highly functioning office; retains institutional knowledge; SW Land Mgmt. is positioned to scale up if additional property received	Aligned with community; authority at the campus level; potential for greater financial returns; potential increased revenue from entrepreneurial spirit at campus; more flexibility	Potential for increased revenue; focuses UA on its core mission; increased opportunity for external collaboration; economies of scale in Land mgmt.; reduction of staff/expenses in SW office	Increase partnerships w/ local service providers at campus level; positive public perception; allows SW to focus on revenue generation; increased competition w/ support service providers; potential to shift risk to service provider
Cons	No change in output, not fulfilling potential; perception of resistance to change; no new cost savings or optimizations	No staff/resources to implement; discourages UA-wide perspective; increased challenge to respond to information requests; duplication of effort; lack of consistency	Potential for decreased revenue; difficult to reverse course if provider is not successful; no UA-community engagement; low success probability based on previous experience; extensive implementation time and costly	Unknown costs; service provider may not know reporting requirements, fees and costs of UA; loss of institutional knowledge; low success probability based on previous experience; extensive implementation time and costly; may not be economically feasible to completely outsource all functions



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Land Management

Options:

	3c. Separate Statewide Land Management from the University	4. Fully Centralize Statewide Land Management	5. Full Decentralization of Statewide Land Management	6. Liquidate Investment Property
Pros	Positions are no longer part of the university; potential to improve financial performance; potential tax benefits; retain staff and institutional knowledge; more political involvement w/ selection of a managing board; no institutional constraints	Single point of contact; improved/faster decisions; better overall performance and consistency; one organization; maintains/capitalizes on existing institutional knowledge; no fragmentation in land mgmt. activities; positioned to scale up	Community engagement at university level; increased university prominence; potentially reduce overhead at SW; more authority at campus level; university has flexibility to meet campus needs	Short term increased community engagement; potential infusion of cash; reduction in management cost; reduce risk and liability exposure; high favorability with legislature; local tax base goes up; most economies of scale; easier asset management
Cons	Potential for increased complexity; no UA-community engagement; complex implementation; loss of institutional knowledge; more political involvement w/ selection of a managing board; potential for mission creep	May not understand local concerns; limited community involvement; distance to point of contact may impede management efforts; additional staffing and authority needed; management may not align w/ campus vision & goals	Probability of inconsistent and competing strategies; duplication of effort; campus engaging in functions outside their core missions; oversight challenges; potential to increase overhead	Firesale prices may not reflect long-term value; loss of capability and expertise; long term decreased community engagement; public perception if UA requests additional lands; inconsistent w/ future land endowments & grants

Initial Thoughts: Maintain current structure; to the extent feasible, decentralize management of educational properties; maintain SW management of investment properties; develop strategic plan for land development and management; and add Facilities leadership responsibilities to the Director of Land Management.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Risk Management	<p><u>Charge</u>: Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one campus, or consolidation at SW of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through outsourcing, automation, intercampus collaboration, process standardization, and other means TBD by the team.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: All Risk Management functions</p>	Optimize resources and align with UA priorities



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Risk Management

Options:

	1. Process Improvement Across the University System in Risk Management	2. Consolidation at One Campus/Statewide	3. Single Functional Experts to Support Whole System	4. Centralized Strategic Issues, Decentralize Operations
Pros	Prospect for future savings; strengthen relationships w/ stakeholders; potential reduction workload; collaboration among units; may require board regulation changes	Increased consistency; elevation of common needs; reduction of staff; centralized logistics; purchasing power; conforms to legislative intent; opportunity for person touch at campuses	Increased consistency and collaboration; use of expertise across system; eliminates redundancy; less funding with only one subject matter expert (SME); on-hand SME	Standardizes strategic issues, but campus focuses on needs; realistic approach to diverse Risk functions; immediate support on-site; cost savings thru economies of scale; aligns with national best practices/industry standards
Cons	Investment of time, money, and staff; may be lengthy implementation; may require board regulation changes; ROI is not immediate	Culture of safety at campuses diminished; reduction of staff limits personal interactions; increased travel costs; increased response time; could result in fines at campus	One SME would mean no alternate/back-up; single person would need understanding of each campus; potential for competing priorities	Similar to status quo; continued campus costs w/ additional support req'd for SW; potential for disagreements between SW and campus administration

Initial Thoughts: Options 1 and 4, with leadership from the Risk Management Council.

Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Focus Area	Charge and Scope	Long Term Goals
Facilities	<p><u>Charge</u>: Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one campus, or consolidation at SW of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through outsourcing, automation, intercampus collaboration, process standardization, and other means TBD by the team.</p> <p><u>Scope</u>: All Facilities functions</p>	Optimize resources and align with UA priorities



Strategic Pathways Phase 3

Facilities

Options:









	1. Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University	2. Increased Contracting of Facility Services	3. Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice President of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University Collaboration
Pros	Strategic alignment of activities; consistency; economies of scale in procurement; centralized processes and functions; public-private partnerships may be more feasible	Reduced costs through vendor competition; leadership could focus on academic mission; preventative maintenance would not compete w/ other spending priorities; reduce FTEs, capital inventory & maintenance, and insurance & equipment costs	Ensures responsiveness; single point of contact; standardize policy, guiding principles and priorities; enhanced collaboration; opportunity to save money on smaller scale projects; maintain existing relationships; does not require a large investment to implement; maintains institutional knowledge; minimal disruption
Cons	Eliminates VCs and Chancellors from decision-making; less responsive to needs; jeopardizes meeting accreditation requirements; previous attempts unsuccessful	Quality harder to maintain; challenge to end contract w/ poor contractor; may be more costly for emergency/priority responses; impact on work study opportunities	Not a major change; unlikely to reduce costs; over-centralization of project approval could reduce flexibility; reinstates an executive-class employee at SW

Initial Thoughts: Option 3.

Strategic Pathways Phase 2 Updates

<http://alaska.edu/pathways/phase-2/>

Strategic Pathways Phase 2 Updates

Focus Area	Decision/Recommendation	Status	
e-Learning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain decentralized structure while increasing collaboration across campuses through e-Learning consortium. Explore outsourcing selected programs to private partner. 2. The Academic Council will solicit interest from academic leaders and report to the President by October 1. 	In progress	
Fisheries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request BOR to approve a BS degree program in fisheries & ocean science jointly offered by UAF and UAS. 	Done	
Community Campuses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. Explore ways to increase campus productivity and cost effectiveness, including expansion of support for/access to e-Learning programs from main campuses. 3. Explore potential partnerships with tribal and other community organizations. Possibilities include conversion to tribal colleges and stronger collaboration with regional vocational centers. 	In planning	
Health	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen intercampus collaboration. 2. Task new UAA College of Health dean/vice provost to lead Statewide health program planning. 3. Near term focus on expanding Nursing and other high demand health professions programs without changing reporting lines or other aspects of health programs now delivered by our community campuses. 4. Present update to President in September. 	In progress	
Human Resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build on current progress through Human Resources Council (HRC). 2. The HRC will propose “back room” functions to be consolidated and will drive standardization, simplification, and automation to free up resources for high value services to faculty and staff. 3. The HR Council will provide its preliminary plan to the President in September. 	In progress	
University Relations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PR 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 November. 2. Each university will form a University PR Council with representatives from key university centers, departments, community campuses, research institutes, and athletics. 	In progress	
Student Services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 2. The preliminary plan will be presented to the President in September. 	In progress	
Institutional Research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of a <i>Collaborative Knowledge Network</i> 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 in September. 	In progress	

Strategic Pathways Phase 2

Timeline








- ✓ Design process, solicit team members, and select teams (Sept. 2016)
- ✓ Meeting 1 (Oct. 4 & 6)
 - ✓ Review charge, scope and goals of the team
 - ✓ Discuss interests, standards, benchmarks
 - ✓ Generate options, outline pros/cons
 - ✓ Update community
- ✓ Meeting 2 (Nov. 7-8*)
 - ✓ Discuss pros/cons of options from Meeting 1
 - ✓ Evaluate options in relation to interests and standards
 - ✓ Identify most viable options for presentation to Summit Team
 - ✓ Update community
- ✓ Teams present to UA President and Summit Team (Jan. 18, 2017)
- ✓ UA President engages public/UA stakeholder groups for feedback
- ✓ UA President presents options to the Board of Regents (March 2)
- ✓ UA President engages public/UA stakeholder groups for feedback
- ✓ Board of Regents decisions (June)

*Nov. 8 meeting postponed due to flight cancellations

Strategic Pathways Phase 1

<http://alaska.edu/pathways/phase-1/>

Strategic Pathways Phase 1

Focus Area	Decision	Status	
Research Administration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy leadership at UAF, with service centers at UAA and UAS focused on grants and contracts management. 2. Finance and Administration Council charged to work with the Research Council to develop a plan to present to President in October. 	Implementation plan being finalized	
Engineering	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement collaborative model with current administrative structure. 2. Require common course numbering/descriptions, a common curriculum committee, joint advisory board, and course sharing to gain economies of scale (e.g., increasing student:faculty ratio) for FY18. 3. Report annually to VPAAR on progress. 4. Revisit in 5 years. 5. Academic Council (AC) to present update to President in September. 	In implementation	
Teacher Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign administrative leadership to UAS. 2. Steering Committee in place and meeting regularly; All-hands faculty and staff meeting took place. 3. External Advisory Council has met. 4. President has asked for input on adjustment to plan, to be discussed by BOR in September. 	Excellent progress being made; adjustment being considered.	
Management / Business	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement 2 deans over 2 schools (UAA and UAF) with programs delivered from faculty at 3 universities. 2. UAS eliminated "School," & folded programs into School of Arts and Sciences. 3. UAA to report in June 2017 on ending MPA program and starting MPP program. 4. AC to present update to President in September. 	MPA report received and under review; changes at UAS on track	
Intercollegiate Athletics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to NCAA refusal to consider UA request for waiver of 10 team rule, in order to avoid risk of violation and sanctions, maintain current number of teams at each campus (13 at UAA, 10 at UAF). 2. Increase private funding support so on par with private (i.e, tuition) share of academic expense. 3. Chancellors to provide plan in October for (#2 above). 	Fundraising plan to be developed	
Procurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy leadership at SW; CPO at UAF; service center at UAA and UAS. 2. Long term goal of 20% savings through bulk purchasing and other means. 3. Implement lean process improvement and seek economies of scale in consultation with IT. 4. Revisit in 3 years. 	In implementation	
Information Technology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce embedded IT personnel in operating units (w/partial exception of those on restricted funds) and make other changes to save 20%. 2. Strengthen IT governance council, chaired by UA CITO. 3. Implement lean process improvement and seek economies of scale, outsourcing, and cloud services. 4. IT Council to present update to President in September. 5. Review in 1 year . 	In implementation	



Strategic Pathways

Discussion