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Charge

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

Scope

All functions related to recruitment, financial aid, registrar, and support system for student retention and completion.

Goal

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

Key Stakeholders

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

Team Members

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

The Student Services Team is one of eight teams in Phase 2 of Strategic Pathways. Phase 2 began in early October when the teams met for the first time. During that first meeting, Session 1, there was a thorough orientation to the overall effort, and the charge, scope, and goal were refined. Most teams also identified the first iteration of potential Options. In the weeks between Session 1 and the second meeting, Session 2, Student Services continued to define the options with weekly teleconferences and virtual collaboration. The Pros and Cons for each Option were developed in Session 2 in the first week in November. Since then Student Services has been continually refining the Options, Opportunities, Pros and Cons and writing them into the following document. These Reports served as the main source of information for the Presentations that will be presented to the Summit Team on January 18th.
Option 1 – Lead Campus (each campus leading a function)

**Narrative Description**

Each campus would become the “lead” in a particular area, for example, Recruitment and Admissions at UAF, Registrar at UAA, Financial Aid at UAS. The other campuses would have reduced staffing in the “non-lead” areas. Some level of staffing in each area would be maintained in order to provide necessary services to students.

**Key Change Elements**

- **Student Experience** – Students could have more seamless experience. Negative impacts will be felt if staffing levels do not adequately cover the needs of the students on-site and if there are delays in service due to staff being located off-site at lead campuses.
- **Service Changes** - Each campus would need to continue providing services that are provided in person, such as counseling and advising. Behind-the-scenes processes and services could be consolidated in one location. Other offices on campus could be impacted if they currently have a close relationship with an office that becomes a non-lead area.
- **Staffing Changes** - Staffing will need to be increased at lead campus for each office and reduced at the non-lead campuses. Some staffing in the non-lead areas would need to be maintained to serve students. Lead campus would have the director and main support staff and non-lead campuses would have smaller teams for non-lead areas. If each campus had a different lead area, the non-lead staff could reside in same office as lead staff. There would be a need for more cross training and collaboration between areas in Student Affairs.
- **Use of Facilities** - Lead campuses would need larger offices for their functions. Non-lead areas could be reduced but would continue to need space, perhaps in a centralized location.
- **Access for Students** - Likely to be impacted: reduced staffing at non-lead locations, and the added levels of separation caused by lead campus duties being off site, could result in longer wait times, services being reduced, and issues being left unresolved. Recruitment may not be as campus specific if more centralized under lead campus.
- **Administration** - There would be one director for each area (Recruitment, Financial Aid, and Registrar) that would be located at the lead campus. Because the responsibilities of the director position would increase, there would probably be a need for Assistant or Associate Directors (one at each university).
- **Front-End Investment** - Training of staff; redesign of office areas; reprinting of marketing materials; administrative costs during transition.
- **Technology** - Current technology would remain in place. More shared services so there would need to be more cross training in technology that supports each area.
Option 1 continued – Lead Campus (each campus leads a function)

Key Change Elements, continued

- Community (external) Engagement - Likely to be minimal unless student experience is negatively impacted. Campuses could be (or seem) less receptive to the local communities in non-lead areas.
- Ongoing investment support - Increased IT support to improve processes and integration; increased travel for staff.

Pros and Cons

Pros

- Still have some support at each campus with the representation of a function
- Opportunity to take advantage of existing strengths
- Efficiency in economy of scale
- Opportunity for improved consistency and collaboration in decision making
- Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure process
- Creation of a more common process for students
- Opportunity to implement a unified recruitment strategy that maps prospective student interest in particular academic program offerings -- instead of university affinity or campus location

Cons

- Significant leadership challenge and professional liability for lead campus to effectively manage staff and operations over such distances. These are high risk and highly regulated areas with significant consequences.
- Community, faculty, and staff perception of decreased services and availability
- Difficulty with separation of functions and loss of synergy between multiple campuses due to high level of needed collaboration between the functions
- Diminished effectiveness and efficiency is likely as a result of the one consolidated university having to know and manage three different sets of business and academic policies, processes and dates
- Potential for non-lead university students to experience an increased sense of bureaucracy resulting from authority/responsibility being located far away from service delivery points
- Student and employees may feel disenfranchised if their university is not named lead
- Faculty relationship challenges with geography due to interrelation between functions and faculty support
Option 1 continued – Lead Campus (each campus leads a function)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros, continued</th>
<th>Cons, continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of synergy between functions within the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty facilitating face-to-face appeal process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-lead campuses will be further removed from process and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining a clear sense of transparent and balanced decision making for the benefit of all students will be a difficulty as student needs are often different at different campuses and at different times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of peer leadership team and peer accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of in state competition in recruiting which is currently an internal motivator for meeting targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of time to ramp up to perform duties i.e., increasing training requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further Analysis Needed

- Process to determine what function would reside at what campus?
- What are the relationships between all other campuses and lead campus and how would they be facilitated?
- Could more than one function reside at a campus?
- What would the reporting structure and authorities be? What would level of decision making for each non-lead campus?
- How would we measure effects on student experience?
- How would a system to maintain accountability for functions be developed?
- What would cost savings be for options and would services be improved?
- What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), DOE financial aid oversight?
- What would campus branding look like in the lead model?
- What would formalized collaboration between the 3 campuses need to be?
Option 2 – Consolidation of All Functions at One Campus

Narrative Description

Consolidate Offices of the Registrar, Financial Aid, and Recruitment and Admission’s responsibilities and functions to one university with support staff on the other two campuses. Each university will still maintain its own unique branding. In area of recruitment the focus would be recruiting students to the right institution. This option would likely drive policy and process change, as it would be necessary to have one procedure for many of the administrative functions of financial aid and registrar’s office. (i.e., would need to report unofficial withdrawals the same to DOE).

Key Change Elements

► Student Experience – May be more difficult to resolve issues as expertise is lost at individual campuses. Possible more consistency for students doing academic work at multiple campuses.

► Service Changes

  o Financial Aid (FA) - one awarding and/or distribution of award money/funds.
  o Office of Registrar - one process for transfer evaluation, one office for processing outgoing transcripts, grade changes, one course scheduling and catalog production, room scheduling coordinating from one site, registration managed from one site, degree awards and audits and academic petitions managed at one site. Student records requests and subpoenas managed at one site. Monitoring of Academic Policy for all three campuses at one site.
  o Recruitment – would be done by one staff for all sites/campuses.
  o Admissions – one office processes and reviews applications for campuses/sites.

► Staffing Changes – Would need staffing increases at campus which hosts offices. Potentially could reduce staffing at remaining campuses, but would still need support staff to meet with students (financial advising, campus tours, manual registrations, commencement, copies of records, etc.) Would be shifting many staff from one location to another. Net reduction of staffing would need to be evaluated. System built to manage internal impacts and support for functions through transition.

► Use of Facilities – Would need increase in consolidate campus. Non-consolidated campuses would have minimal if any. You will still need on-site staff.

► Access for Students – These are core services and often require personal face to face time with students. Without recruitment, financial aid, or course registration a student does not attend. Fewer staff will result in less access/availability for students.
Option 2 continued – Consolidation of All Functions at One Campus

Continuation of Key change elements

► Administration – Would remove 2 Registrars, 2 Directors of Financial Aid, and 2 Directors of Recruitment/Admissions.
► Front-End Investment – For Registrar and Recruitment there would be time required to learn other two campuses: curriculum, policies, processes, catalog, student body (training investment). Hiring of additional staff for one location and relationship building of these key staff with the other campus personnel.
► Technology – Would need to ensure common systems across the board. Must be much more robust and more bandwidth as more communication goes between campuses. Two thirds of students will only interact with these core services via distance/technology. Will need to improve options for doing this.
► Community (external) Engagement – Interactions with community at two campuses without offices will be reduced. Lose personal touch.
► Ongoing investment support – Training will need to be constant. Recruitment office will need to stay well informed of the communities of all universities and campuses. Others will need to stay constantly up-to-date on 3 campus procedures, staff, faculty, and policies.

Pros and Cons

Pros
► Opportunity for improved consistency in decision making and policies
► Potential for efficiency in economy of scale
► Opportunity to implement a unified recruitment strategy that maps prospective student interest in particular academic program offerings – instead of university affinity or campus location
► Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure processes allowing for reallocation of resources
► Increased motivation to create more common student services processes for students

Cons
► Significant leadership challenge and professional liability for lead campus to effectively manage staff and operations over such distances
► Community, faculty, and staff perception of decreased services and availability
► Diminished effectiveness and efficiency is likely as a result of the one consolidated university having to know and manage three different sets of business and academic policies, processes and dates
► Maintaining a clear sense of transparent and balanced decision making for the benefit of all students will be difficult as student needs are often different at different campuses and at different times
**Option 2 continued – Consolidation All Functions at One Campus**

**Pros, continued**
- Recruitment could have cost savings
- Potential streamlining of administrative process
- Eliminate redundancy

**Cons, continued**
- Implementation process includes external decision makers (stakeholders) that have competing interests
- Potential for non-consolidated university students to experience an increased sense of bureaucracy resulting from authority/responsibility being located farther away from service delivery points
- Student and employees may feel disenfranchised if their university is not named lead
- Potential for disenfranchisement and less accountability at non-consolidated universities and their associated campuses
- Faculty relationship challenges with geography
- Difficulty in facilitating face-to-face appeal process
- Loss of peer leadership team and peer accountability
- Long implementation process
- Non-consolidated campuses will be further removed from process and decision making
- Without a significant change and alignment of individual campus policies and processes, a change of this magnitude would result in greater staff time, longer response times, and has a higher probability of error
- Difficulty to change policies that impact processes which lie in other areas
Option 2 continued – Consolidation All Functions at One Campus

Further Analysis Needed

► What would cost savings be for options and would services be improved?
► What would process be to determine which university owns all functions?
► What are the relationships between all other campuses and lead campus and how would they be facilitated?
► What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), DOE financial aid oversight?
► What would the reporting structure and authorities be? What would level of decision making for each non-consolidated campus?
► What would campus branding look like in the consolidated model?
► How to incorporate a voice for other universities during decision making process?
Option 3 – Consolidation at Statewide

Narrative Description

Assuming separate accreditation remains. Registrar, Financial Aid, Recruitment offices will be consolidated at a single Statewide office. Individual Registrar, Admissions, and Financial Aid Offices would no longer exist at UAF, UAA, and UAS. Instead, a combined “Enrollment Services” office would be created at Statewide. This office would be responsible for all Admission, Financial Aid, and Registrar functions for the entire University of Alaska. There would be staff available at each campus that would be able to support and direct students in person.

Key Change Elements

- **Student Experience** – A certain self-sufficient type of student would notice little or no difference. Students who require more guidance may struggle not having in-person help available with expertise in a specific area of concern.
- **Service Changes** – Same services would be offered, but out of one Statewide office instead of each MAU and branch campus.
- **Staffing Changes** – Same amount of work to be done, so roughly the same number of employees would be required. May be able to reduce director/manager positions but would need to replace with technician/advisor positions. May be able to reduce/combine fiscal tech and PPA type positions.
- **Use of Facilities** – Likely need to build a building or rent space somewhere. Approximately 110 people currently work in these areas at UAA, UAF, and UAS combined. There is not currently room in the Butrovich building for added Statewide positions. Travel and teleconferencing may be less necessary with everyone in the same geographic area.
- **Access for Students** – Students outside of the Fairbanks area would not have “live, in-person” help available. Coordination of campus visits for Anchorage/Juneau will be logistically more difficult with no on-site admissions personnel. Academic advising still available at each MAU within academic departments. Access would be provided to in person support at each campus.
- **Administration** – “Chain of command” would be shorter. Students would have one office to deal with and address concerns. Matrix reporting would need to be established with campuses reporting to Statewide. Relationships would need to be reestablished/strengthened being managed from distances.
- **Front-End Investment** – Buildings/offices to house additional roles within Statewide. Hiring will be necessary to replace those who do not relocate. Training of new employees.
- **Ongoing investment support (reallocation of funds)** - Assume current Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid budgets would be combined and redirected to a new “Statewide Student Services” fund.
Option 3 continued – Consolidation at Statewide

Key Change Elements, continued

- Technology – Use of skype or similar applications for recruiting and admission advising. Banner Financial Aid may need to be unMEP’ed if financial aid offices are completely combined.
- Community (external) Engagement – Would be more difficult to cultivate and participate in community engagement in Anchorage/Juneau with no student services office or employees on site.

Pros and Cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◀ Eliminate redundancy</td>
<td>▶ Disconnected from direct student experience and the need to coordinate processes for the greatest positive impact and least negative impact on students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Consistency in decision making and policies</td>
<td>▶ Potential for each university’s students to experience an increased sense of bureaucracy resulting from authority/responsibility being located far away from service delivery points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Efficiency in economy of scale</td>
<td>▶ Impact on service to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure process</td>
<td>▶ Faculty relationship challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Would increase need in formalized collaboration</td>
<td>▶ Knowing and managing policies at 3 different universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◀ Recruitment could have cost savings</td>
<td>▶ Implementation process includes external decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Universities removal from process and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Loss of peer leadership team and peer accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Potential student perceptions may lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Community perception of decreased services and availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Long implementation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Staff and faculty feeling devalued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Not currently engaged in the processes that shifted to Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Biggest shift in operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Internal political implications of shift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Option 3 continued – Consolidation at Statewide**

**Cons, continued**

- Trust
- Perception UAF would benefit from Statewide proximity
- Perception of alumni at each university
- Reallocation of resources (positions, infrastructure and budget)
- Amount of time to ramp up to perform duties and training needs

**Further Analysis Needed**

- What would the reporting structure (matrix) and authorities be? What would level of decision making for each campus?
- What are the relationships between all other campuses and Statewide and how would they be facilitated?
- What would happen to Anchorage/Juneau employees not willing/able to relocate to Fairbanks?
- What are the risks in these highly regulated areas and the potentially significant consequences for misfeasance? Title IV (financial aid and registrar), accreditation status (regional and program), DOE financial aid oversight?
- What would cost savings be for options and would services be improved?
- What would campus branding look like?
- How to incorporate a voice for universities during decision making process?
- Would change involve a shift physically or just reporting structure?
- How to demystify Statewide to university stakeholders?
- Would option elevate level of priority of student services?
- Will this option help us achieve long term goals and vision?
Option 4 – Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide

Narrative Description

This option looks at a variety of tasks currently processed at each university with an intention to consolidate the task(s) of the three functions at one university or Statewide but not necessarily the same university or Statewide for each task. Face to face services are maintained at each campus.

Sample list of Student Services Tasks

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

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

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

Retention Activities
- Provide predictive analytics/software for retention and support (this is where opportunity for centralized retention effort)
  - Including holistic picture of student
  - With accountability for the university
  - Retention Rx (example)
  - Centralized data for units
Option 4 continued – Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide

Key Change Elements

- Student Experience
  - Registrar - Potential for slight decrease mitigated by increased speed and efficiency of uniform service.
  - Financial Aid - Potential slight decrease mitigated by increased speed and efficiency of uniform service.
  - Recruitment - “Retention begins with recruitment” - done correctly, recruitment activities lead to greater retention of student. Potentially increasing new student enrollment.
  - Retention - Increased retention of at risk students.

- Service Changes
  - Registrar - N/C to service, same activity now at one location.
  - Financial Aid - Faster processing; quicker response and communication.
  - Recruitment - Communicating with all AK students.
  - Retention - Increase outreach to students the data predicts are at risk.

- Staffing Changes
  - Registrar - Need more info.
  - Financial Aid - Zero net (possibly reallocation of resources).
  - Recruitment - Communicating with all AK students.
  - Retention - Increase outreach to students the data predicts are at risk.

- Use of Facilities - N/C

- Access for Students

- Administration
  - Registrar - Work team; collaboration exists among University Registrars; could be model for other service areas.
  - Financial Aid - Work team.
  - Recruitment - Work team.
Retention - To start: Office of Academic Affairs & Research (Statewide) - after incubation period - moves to the universities.

Front-End Investment
- Registrar - Nominal investment, security and supplies.
- Financial Aid - Programmer and software costs.
- Recruitment - Some investment to get the processes working.
- Retention - Yes - consulting, software, staffing (at universities) and support. Increasing retention would have a great ROI and might mean increased revenues further down the line. Increased retention reduces the waste of the State’s investment when a student drops out after a few semesters.

Community (external) Engagement
- Registrar - N/C
- Financial Aid - Potential disconnect working with scholarship agencies or native corporations. Campuses have relationships with specific agencies and native corporations - these relationships are susceptible to changes at either the agency or UA.
- Recruitment - High Schools may need to work with UA.
- Retention - Potential for engagement.

Technology
- Registrar – To connect students and staff with tasks not located at their home campus.
- Financial Aid - Programmer and software costs.
- Recruitment – Programming and process restructures.
- Retention – Software to support retention tasks.

Ongoing Investment Support - Ongoing investment and support needed (technology and staffing changes). System developed to calculate ROI on investments into Student Services.

Pros and Cons

Pros
- Take advantage of existing strengths
- Potential for reallocation of resources
- Allows for high level of innovation in processes
- Efficiency in economy of scale
- Potential for reduction in costs
- Eliminate redundancy
- Opportunity to reevaluate, modernize, automate, and restructure process
- Increase in formalized collaboration
- Allows you to be targeted
- Consistency in decision making

Cons
- Removal from process and decision making
- Political perception of Statewide owning tasks
- Perception of Statewide growing
- Change in ownership
- Reallocation of resources
- Questionable accountability
- Campus acting in Statewide manner due to vested interests
Options 4 continued – Consolidation of Tasks Between Universities and Statewide

Pros, continued

- Implementation flexibility
- Some technology is already present
- Consistency in student experience (net improvement of student experience)

Further Analysis Needed

- Who will be evaluating the performance of task areas?
- What does the ideal structure look like and what will be the plan for reevaluation?
- How would relationships be managed between each university and Statewide?
- What voice will other campuses have if task handling is not working for them?
- How do monitor both internal and external customer service levels?
- What is the process for picking the correct tasks and owners of tasks (ex., cost, service to students, time, structure, expertise, etc.)?
- How to incorporate a voice for universities during decision making process?
- What would communication plan be to students and stakeholders to create certainty and relieve anxiety regarding changes?
Option 5 – Further Decentralization of SIS

Narrative Description

Banner Student is the current SIS used system-wide. One instance of Banner Student is centrally managed by the system offices. This option proposes that the current single instance of Banner Student be decommissioned and the three Universities manage their own SIS instance.

Key Change Elements

- **Student Experience** – Potentially very different application, admission, financial aid and registration experiences for students who attend more than one UA institution.
- **Service Changes** – Decommission the single instance of Banner Student. UAA, UAF and UAS would then select and independently manage their own SIS.
- **Staffing Changes** – Banner Student Programmers would be transferred to UA Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau.
- **Use of Facilities** – No change.
- **Access for Students** – During transitory period, students (as well as faculty and staff) would likely lose access to all front-facing and internal Banner services. Depending on the individual needs/desires of each campus, students could receive additional or reduced front-facing Banner functionality (namely, UAOnline, cross-campus course registration).
- **Administration** – No change.
- **Front-End Investment** – Significant costs to procure and set up new Student Information Systems.
- **Ongoing investment support (reallocation of funds)** - Reallocate funds associated with the decommissioning of Banner Student at the system office to the three universities.
- **Technology** – Significant changes.
- **Community (external) Engagement** – No change.

Pros and Cons

**Pros**

- SIS related enhancements would happen faster and upgrades could be more frequent, not nearly as time consuming
- Each university’s SIS could be highly personalized to maximize effectiveness and efficiency for students and employees
- Each university would have freedom to be highly responsive to emerging needs
- More positive student experience

**Cons**

- Universities may code and report data differently causing decreased efficiency due to more variables within data and would negatively impact the service experience for students
- Universities would likely operate more independently
- Would require the purchase and maintenance of 3 systems
### Option 5 continued – Further Decentralization of SIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pros, continued</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cons, continued</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Less work teams/less time spent in meetings</td>
<td>▶ Students may need to send transcripts between campuses. If applying to more than one would need to send test scores to multiple places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶</td>
<td>▶ Students interacting with multiple SIS would experience greater confusion and frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶</td>
<td>▶ Loss ability to seamlessly share data between universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶</td>
<td>▶ Wouldn’t be able to combine enrollment for purposes of reporting student’s full-time or part-time status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶</td>
<td>▶ Not aligned with Board of Regents priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Further Analysis Needed

- What is cost for purchase and maintenance of 3 systems?
- How many students cross-enroll?
- Does the fluidity of those impacted outweigh benefit to those who don’t cross-enroll?
- What is impact of OIT staffing?
- If there were separate instances of Banner would we need separate instances of Onbase or other software?
Other Opportunities for Change

- Formalize collaboration and decision making rules between universities
- Sharing resources between universities
- Integrate financial aid education as a part of recruitment/admissions process
- Modify Banner F.A. for only paying-degree applicable courses with aid
- Develop system to reach students we don’t know are interested
- Link applying for: PFD, Tax Returns, and FAFSA (Ted Malone idea) to increase students who apply for financial aid
- Link application for Admissions with FAFSA application and vice versa to ensure students know they need to fill out both forms
- 1:1 financial aid counseling with new students utilizing subject matter experts
- Creating and fostering a good relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs
- Create common experiences for students who do their “business” at multiple campuses
  - Registration and bill payment
- Course sequencing for all degrees
- Create degree plans for every student
- Do orientations in student’s school/hometown to teach about university in their comfort zone and then bring to campus
- Integrate Accounting services/Bursar into Student Affairs
- Transcripts UA- One paper with all the information on the back to meet all campuses
- Create system to use predictive /software system data at university level and investment in staff to support use of data
- Investigate financial aid leveraging (formalized)
  - More efficiently use the money we distribute (~$132M) thru financial aid to support retention and increase enrollment
- Put IR and Student Affairs groups together to work out (data) and collaborations on how we approach options using data
- Common Calendar – add the student accounts fee payment, deadline to align – All the dates

Addendums

1. Organizational Charts
2. Student Affairs Core Services
UAF Financial Aid Org Chart

Deanna Dieringer
Director

Ruby Bazor
Advisor
CTC Specialist

Julie Parshall
Associate Director
Tech Specialist

Martika Hubbard
Advisor
Verification Specialist

VACANT
Advisor
Scholarship Specialist

Ashley Munro
Associate Director
Outreach Specialist

Becky Phillips
Advisor
VA Specialist

Student Workers
# UAS – Enrollment Management and Student Affairs  
## CORE FUNCTIONS [DRAFT]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>First Year Experience</th>
<th>K-12 Outreach and Summer Programs</th>
<th>Marketing and Web</th>
<th>Native and Rural Student Center</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Study Away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - New admits to enrollee conversion  
- SEVIS management  
- Undergraduate and graduate admissions coordination & processing | - Financial aid education  
- Regulatory compliance  
- Student financial aid administration  
- Scholarship management | - New Student Orientation  
- First Year Academic Checklist  
- Don’t Miss List  
- Alaska Leadership Initiative (AL-I)  
- Alcohol and drug education programming  
- First year student programming  
- FYE Poster Series | - Publications  
- Webmaster | - Alaska Native & Rural student services  
- Cultural programming  
- Student Advocacy  
- Outreach  
- PITAAS programming  
- Native Graduation | - Undergraduate recruitment  
- In-state, out of state, transfer recruitment  
- Fly-ins  
- Campus tours  
- Placement testing | - Academic room scheduling  
- Banner student security  
- Class schedule production & maintenance  
- Course registration management  
- Enrollment & award verification & production  
- FERPA training & compliance oversight  
- Catalog management | - National Student Exchange  
- International Student Exchange  
*Denotes Collaborative Signature Program |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Dining</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Residence Life</th>
<th>Student Health Center</th>
<th>Campus Recreation</th>
<th>Study Away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Lakeside Grill / Cafeteria  
- Spike’s Coffee  
- Bear’s Pantry Convenience Store  
- Lakeside Convenience Store  
- UAS apparel and gifts  
- Catering | - Freshman and Sophomore Residence Hall facility management and oversight  
- Apartment and family living  
- Student safety and crisis response  
- Community development  
- Personal development programming  
- Reflective student engagement  
- Summer Conference & Guest Housing  
- Faculty in Residence Program | - Counseling Center  
- Disability Support Services; accommodation management  
- Health Center  
- Physical health care; diagnosis; crisis response  
- Immunizations  
- Health and wellness education  
- Safe Zone | - Joint Use Facility operations and facilities management  
- Open gym and intramural programming  
- Outdoor recreation rental program  
- Fitness classes and personal training  
- Physical health and wellness programming | - National Student Exchange  
*Denotes Collaborative Signature Program |

| Student Activities | Campus Life & Conduct |  |  | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|  |  | |
| - Student engagement and leadership development  
- Alaska Leadership Initiative (AL-I)  
- Student Activities Board  
- Student Clubs and Organizations  
- Service Learning  
- USUAS-JC Student Government  
- Whalesong Student Newspaper  
- Whale Wednesdays  
- Alaska Airlines Student Concert Series | - Student Affairs leadership (Housing, Activities, Rec, Dining)  
- Student Code of Conduct Administration  
- Student behaviors intervention and crisis response  
- Student advocacy  
- Conflict resolution  
- Staff development and support  
- Alaska Leadership Initiative, Gold (ALI-Gold)  
- Power and Privilege Symposium*  
- Campus Kickoff*  
- Community Thanksgiving*  
- Winterfest*  
- Spring Carnival* |  |  | |

| Career Services |  |  |  | |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| - Career and job fairs  
- Job search  
- Internship coordination  
- On-campus employment coordination |  |  |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC ADVISING CENTER</th>
<th>DISABILITY SERVICES</th>
<th>RURAL STUDENT SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General studies/undeclared comprehensive advising</td>
<td>• Disability eligibility</td>
<td>• Comprehensive advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-major general studies/undeclared comprehensive advising</td>
<td>• Academic and classroom accommodations</td>
<td>• Financial aid and scholarship assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic and career exploration</td>
<td>• ADA compliance and accessibility</td>
<td>• Student retention/degree completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AHEAD advising</td>
<td>• Facilitate communication between student and faculty</td>
<td>• Placement testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Degree completion</td>
<td>• ADA training</td>
<td>• Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interdisciplinary studies major/minor</td>
<td>• Campus awareness of eats</td>
<td>• Regional/village organization liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-professional advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student athlete advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural programming and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic appeals/SAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>• High school outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Credit for prior learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>• New student transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-degree seeking advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate advisor trainings and financial aid workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-degree academically disqualified student advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASUAF</th>
<th>FINANCIAL AID OFFICE</th>
<th>TRIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student government</td>
<td>• FAFSA processing</td>
<td>• Comprehensive advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• KSUA 91.5 FM radio station</td>
<td>• Financial aid packaging and disbursement</td>
<td>• Student mentoring and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sun Star student newspaper</td>
<td>• Campus visits</td>
<td>• Cultural programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concert board</td>
<td>• NCAA compliance</td>
<td>• Laptop/technology loan program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RISEboard (sustainability)</td>
<td>• K-12 outreach</td>
<td>• TRIO grant compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulatory compliance</td>
<td>• Student retention/degree completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State aid programs</td>
<td>• New student transition services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional scholarship administration</td>
<td>• Supplemental math skills instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Veterans’ education benefits</td>
<td>• Financial literacy education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual advising</td>
<td>• Individual tutoring/peer coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial literacy education</td>
<td>• STEM student support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER SERVICES</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES</th>
<th>WOOD CENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resume, cover letter and interview coaching</td>
<td>• International student/scholar advising</td>
<td>• Student activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-campus employment recruitment/career fairs</td>
<td>• International orientation/acculturation</td>
<td>• Pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employer relations</td>
<td>• International exchange/study abroad</td>
<td>• Leadership, Involvement and Volunteer Experience (LIVE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEAN OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND THE REGISTRAR</th>
<th>RESIDENCE LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student advocacy</td>
<td>• Undergraduate recruitment</td>
<td>• Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complaint and conflict resolution services</td>
<td>• New student orientation</td>
<td>• Housing placement and assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student behavior intervention and crisis response</td>
<td>• Application processing</td>
<td>• Resident safety and security oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavior Intervention Team (BIT)</td>
<td>• Student ambassadors</td>
<td>• Resident crisis response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal compliance mandate</td>
<td>• Campus visits and events</td>
<td>• Resident conduct management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alcohol, drugs and safety education</td>
<td>• Student communications</td>
<td>• Residential programming and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student code of conduct administration</td>
<td>• Transcript evaluation</td>
<td>• Summer guest housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student ethical and leadership development</td>
<td>• Catalog management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student policy</td>
<td>• Registration/class scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment and reporting</td>
<td>• Graduation/degree audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research and data analysis</td>
<td>• NCAA compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION, ADVENTURE AND WELLNESS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Patty Ice Arena</td>
<td>• Community development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patty Pool</td>
<td>• Housing placement and assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Recreation Center (SRC)</td>
<td>• Resident safety and security oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outdoor Adventures</td>
<td>• Resident crisis response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intramural sports</td>
<td>• Resident conduct management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | |
| | | 01/2017 |
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