University of Alaska Academic Structure Change Management

Focus: CTE/Community Campuses

Session Notes, August 2019

First Session (Fairbanks and on-line)

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

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

Welcome:
- This is chance to consider what a single UA might look like for the community campuses
- These sessions were planned in the context of a one-year $135 million cuts. Some of that pressure is off, but we are still looking at a $70 million cut over three years and even the one-year $25 million cut this year is a challenge
- The aim today is to have this conversation in response to the Board's directive to prepare for an approach that would address consolidation and coordination, as well as accreditation
- We are joined by people on line, include Regents

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

Additional Proposed Groundrules:
- Focus on interest and options – avoid jumping to positions.
- Be hard on the issues, not each other.
- Operate with transparency – notes will be recorded live on a cloud-based, shared document.
- Be mindful of the time available in each session; issues that can't be resolved during the session will be placed on a "parking lot" in the notes.

- Turn off electronics during the session; observers may communicate (in person or electronically) with participants with whom they have connections before and after the sessions, but should only serve as observers during the sessions.

Change Management Model:
Phase 1: Hopes & Fears (45 min.)
Phase 2: Vision & Data (45 min.)
Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests (45 min.)
Phase 4: Alignment & Options (60 min. + Session 2)
Phase 5: Recommendations & Implementation (Session 2)

Phase 1a: Hopes
- As we move forward we keep in mind the students in rural Alaska – the unique challenges and strengths, as well what is common among all students
- Through this process we hope to highlight the role of community campuses and career/technical education to the legislature
- The work of this committee focus more on community campuses broadly, not just CTE (which is a smaller portion of what we teach)
- To ensure that there is alignment with health programs at UAA, UAF, and UAS – all aligned
- The community college mission could be better defined and embraced – opening up doors for funding and service to students
- We don't lose sight of the social justice implications associated with reducing geographic barriers and service to all Alaskans
- Serving students – especially non-traditional students – will be advanced
    - Together we can focus on interested students of all ages as they fulfill their career and personal dreams that meets their unique needs and obligations
- Hope we can continue to offer and expand degrees and endorsements across Alaska
- A hope that there will be options for students to seamlessly transition across programs with CTE learning
- Those making decisions will keep the big picture in mind, including Alaska Native specific education (pre-K through graduate education)
- The main AUs campuses and UA statewide will recognize the significance and importance of providing 42% of the headcount across the system
- We continue to recognize the public service aspect of what we do around extension and non-credit instruction in this process
- We stop being referred to as community colleges – we are community campuses
- Community campuses retain the ability to deliver lower and upper level courses
- Through this process we can highlight the important role of CTE in economic development for the state – elevating the role not just in the university system, but with all stakeholders

Phase 1b: Fears
- That the budget cuts will compromise service to students in rural Alaska
- That we lose the local connections and the ability to respond in a timely manner to industry
    - Losing community connections and support
- A fear that community campuses will just be learning centers with the majority of courses delivered on-line or by video conference from the main campus AUs
- The few bachelor's degrees will not survive the current situation
- A fear that Alaska could be the only state without a community campus mission and vision that is recognized by all stakeholders
- A fear that we will lose the student focus as we streamline services and support
- Access will be limited as a result of this process – limiting programs, certifications, degrees, and pure love of learning

2

- A fear that community campuses will lose vibrancy and nimbleness
    - If there is a larger administrative unit it will undercut responsiveness
- A concern on where preparatory studies and other services will fit
    - There are important services that should not be lost
    - Who will do this if not us
- A fear that the many social justice projects will be undercut
- If the plan is to further integrate community campuses we might lose federal funding for Alaska Native services
- A fear of losing the 1 and 2 year OEs and other specialized training

Phase 2a: Elements of a Future Success Vision – 2025
- Alignment across community campuses and across four-year degree programs
- Place committed students will be served without their having to move
- Eliminating obstacles to students (costs, fees, scholarships) in order to support more completers
- A structure that fosters collaboration and innovation to deliver high demand programs and services
- A structure that allows career and tech ed to be self-supporting through tuition, grants, and gifts
- Seeing our consumers as students, industry and communities and serving them with increased access
- Answering the career technology needs of the communities we serve
- Students regardless of location have access to programs and the program are delivered without redundancy, while still being responsive to the needs of place committed students
- Supporting students taking transitional classes to be successful – moving through courses efficiently – with multiple definitions of success in serving students
- Articulation agreements will be streamlined making transfers into the rest of the university system seamlessly
- External accreditation will be maintained with any new structure
- Student advising will be robust, along with other on-site student services and academic support
- To continue to serve the large numbers of students served
- Many campuses quality as Alaska Native serving, which should be maintained and increased
- A structure that fosters partnership and continuous engagement with partners – industry, K-12, faculty
- Identify centers of excellence across the system
- Align business practices to increase efficiency – resulting in a seamless student experience
- Continued faculty development
- Ensuring robust on-line support for instruction

Phase 2b: Relevant and <u>Available</u> Data
- A clear definition when the data is pulled on what is a CTE (not all units define things the same way)
- Head count and credit hours on all CTE classes offered by community campuses in the last year
- Head count and credit hours on all GERs and other course offered by community campuses in the last year
- Look at demand in the state of Alaska – external demand for programs (existing programs and potential new ones)
- Look at what other training providers are delivering outside of the university

- A clear definition when the data is pulled on what is a CTE (not all units define things the same way)
- Identifying how many programs – such as in the maritime consortium
  - Know what we have throughout the state
- Look at cost per credit hour
- Look at external accreditation programs – the full list
- Look at equipment and facilities available, linked to CTE
- Look at the list of learning modalities across the state – what is delivered entirely with eLearning and other means
- Not just degree or certificate completion, but course completion rates
  - Look at five-year average for programs and awards
- Look at head count and credit hours offered via distance
- The tech prep model in each community campus – duel enrollment and tech prep numbers
- Instill some level of quality control in this process – oversight with the data
- Data on Alaska Native enrollment – to better understand this student base

Phase 3: Stakeholders & Interests

Stakeholders	Interests
All stakeholders (shared interests)	• The value of job training • Educated populace
Undergraduate students	• Courses available for place-committed students • A variety of delivery modalities • Will my program still exist? • Desire for streamlined processes • Alignment of programs for transferability • Convenient for students, registration, billing, • Jobs after graduation
Graduate students	• Will my program still exist? • Desire for streamlined processes • Would the campus exist?
Faculty	• Will my program still exist?; job security; retaining faculty • Opportunity for expanded offerings • Will governance structure represent all faculty and the faculty curriculum process? • Concern for students • Managing increased workloads in a challenging environment • Concern of promotion/tenure
Staff	• Job security - how to retain staff? • Concern for students • Managing increased workloads in a challenging environment • Non-represented employees are more susceptible to budget challenges • Collective groups of staff make up community campuses, each campus has its own distinct interests/needs
Research centers and institutes	• Collaboration and partnerships • Risk to funding • Decreased access for grad students
Statewide university Administration	• Smooth transition • Responding appropriately to the Board of Regents

Board of Regents	- Moody rating - Positive feedback - Service to the State of Alaska
Communities	Continued access, student services, stability, educational opportunities, and local workforce training, partnerships and relationships
Parents	- A variety of delivery modalities - Will their kid's course of study be cancelled? - Confidence in programs - Dual enrollment ops - One stop quality service - Cost
Alumni	- A degree they can be proud of, that they can use for work - Reputation of the university
Donors	- Student success, scholarship opportunities - Concern gift will be spent as intended
Employers/ industry	- A well-trained local workforce - A variety of delivery modalities - A steady flow of workers - Programs aligned to meet workforce needs
Alaska Native Corporations and other Alaska Native entities	- Job training - Culturally responsive education - Members have access to education - Native language preservation
Legislature	- Cost effective education - Programs that are responsive to constituents' needs
Accreditors	Academic integrity, continuous improvement
Funders	- Robust programs that other institutions can emulate - Results, impacts
School districts K-12, including high schools, middle schoolers, home schoolers, and others	- Service to students not being able to go to college close to home - A variety of delivery modalities - Will students be able to pursue the same programs if single accreditation is adopted? - Dual credit options that lead to degrees - Career prep - Support for college readiness/interest programs that campuses have been covering - kids to college, I know I can, college goal alaska, fafsa frenzy, etc - Support for students completing teaching degrees across Alaska
Military	- Will courses transfer? Acceptance of credits from outside? E-learning opportunities for those on deployment, ships, etc. - Tuition assistance concerns: advisors to plan degrees and office to process payment applications
Local tribal, city, and borough governments	- Financial support for specific students or programs - Programs that meet local needs - Continuation of successful partnerships
Advisory councils	- Ability to have input on curriculum updates - Concerns for the future of their campuses - Keeping abreast of what is happening on campus as well as other campuses

	• Advocating for campus needs with other community members, organizations, etc.
Trade unions and apprenticeship programs	• Earning credits for training • Access to Univ Programs for related instruction • Connections to find interns and future employees • Instruction/program assistance
Departments of Education, Labor, Transportation, Health, and other state agencies	• Alignment with the needs of teachers and administrators for degrees, certifications, required courses, etc (EED) • What are their employment needs as they look into the years ahead. • Partnering on dual enrollment • Partnering on apprenticeship
Grantees	• Concern for continuance of funded programs due to matching, etc. • On-site support for funded programs that are region-specific • Maintaining eligibility for specific campus-level programs. E.g. Title III
Regional training centers	• Concern over competition with CTE programs • Is there duplication of effort? Is housing available?
Veterans and GI bill students	• Availability, wait time for financing; "brick and mortar" classes to claim Alaska housing benefits levels
UA colleges	• Access to certain courses for CTE degree requirements • Will community campuses compete with them for HC, SCH? • Who approves instructors for upper division courses. Frequently UD courses proposed for delivery at community campuses or online by qualified instructors are not approved by the MAU as they consider this as competition. UAS has a different structure that integrates faculty so this is not an issue.. • Online GER class maximums. Presently MAUs offer online classes for 100+ students while community campuses usually cap them at 30-40.
Incarcerated individuals	• access to placement testing • re-entry programs • outreach

Phase 4a: Alignment

Points of Alignment:
- Having an educated populace
- The value of job training
- All partners need local access to local classes
- Alignment around the students being central
- We all have to have community support
  - Meeting community and cultural needs
- Commitment to the region
  - Alignment on being responsive to local stakeholders
- Serving the workforce needs of the state
- The need for and the desire for multiple modalities to serve place-based students
- The local authority to schedule courses and offer CTE offerings
  - Not bound by the calendar
- Calendar alignment among the community campuses

Points of Misalignment:
- Who will ultimately be responsible for delivering GERs, upper division course, and non-career and technical courses?
  - Who decides?
- Community campuses are not limited to courses and programs in a single field of study like the main campuses – a point of misalignment
  - However UAF CTC is limited in courses and programs, OEs one year, and two year programs,
- There are campuses in Fairbanks and Anchorage that are not considered community campuses – so where do they fit? They are in the community campus director's council.
- Tuition revenue sharing models – across community and main campuses
- The adjunct approval process is not aligned
- The fee structure doesn't reflect the identity of a community campus student
- Who "owns" the multiple modalities for delivering education?
- A misalignment where there isn't local authority to schedule courses and offer CTE offerings
- Cost effectiveness is hard to assess and thus becomes a misalignment
- Credit hours is an area of misalignment
- Potential misalignment on availability of lab space and other resources, which limits enrollment
  - Same with student faculty ratios
- MAU colleges don't realize the cost of CTE offerings – not seeing that cost for nursing, welding, paramedicine, etc.

Observations on the Mapping:
- The community campuses evolve to respond to the educational needs in the regions – there are differences, but the differences are responsive to local needs and this surfaces a risk in trying to connect things in ways that would undercut local responsiveness
- Community Campus Directors Council connects us in helpful ways without a top-down structure – a way of sharing without a rigid format
  - The importance of lateral or horizontal alignment as a new organizational and institutional form
- There is a need for more information to complete this exercise
  - The data identified earlier would help in this process
- This exercises reveals the importance of having multiple perspectives represented
- Interesting to see how many partial connections there were – some both red and green, for example

Phase Concluding Comments:
- There will not be a structure decision at the September meeting, but recommendations on the process going forward
- This is a highly engaged group
  - Remarkable use of technology with great opportunities
- This was a rapid-fire idea generating forum
- It is good to keep this conversation going
- There will be consultation with additional groups, students, faculty governance, advisory groups, and other stakeholders
  - There needs to be a broader conversation – these are important ideas, but not the only ideas
- The motion from the Board of Regents was to consider options and this group is a unique one under the charge given how learning is changing

- o The situation may not be as dire as the $135 million cut, but it is still a budget challenge
- o We can cut cost, combine programs, and build ways to grow revenue – there are multiple options
- o The board will be making decisions about structure and there are issues in addition to structure that need discussion
- Think of this as moving away from the current levels of dependence on the State of Alaska funding
- There will be additional work between September and November
- It is a unique opportunity to rethink what it means to be a university in the State of Alaska in the Arctic in the 21st Century

4b: Options
- Have UAF CTC as a model for consolidation with a focus on OEs, certificates and AAS and AA
- A structure that facilitates collaboration across all rural campuses while meeting local needs
- An alternative model is UAS with integration into the faculty
    - o Such as one faculty for natural sciences, etc. across the three campuses
- Involvement with bachelor's degrees such as happens at UAS continuing
- CCDC has active engagement from all directors, and have that group elect a chair but keep the lateral structure
    - o Note that the placement of a chair was an appointment by the President four years ago
- An option to more fully understand the different local structures and operations
- Reconsider consortium model? Other UA groups seem to be supporting this. Can do consortium model and continue to look at single accreditation or other options.
    - o This builds on the options considered back in March where there was a primary interest in the status quo (with some support for other options) and with a view favoring exploration of single accreditation on slower basis
- A structure that separates career and technical programs from the myriad and important issues that are also part of the community campuses – both important and different
- As we look at the situation, we are the access point in the regions and the option is not to just focus on a "community college" mission
- An option with "centers of excellence" that are shared across campuses and these could be located around the state, including some of the community campuses
- A consolidated model where all Community campuses and colleges are under one unit
    - o In looking at the organizational chart from one of the earlier budget discussions, it raised the question as to who will be in charge of the academics, the colleges, and CTE?
- A model where two units are formed under UA: All urban based CTC and Community campuses are under one unit, and all rural or ANSI community campuses are in another

Second Session (Anchorage and on-line)

Phase 4b: Options (continued)

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

- Create a statewide College of Career and Technical Education that oversees and delivers all technical programs, including at the community campuses, through a center of excellence model.
  - The community campuses could form a separate statewide collaborative model, perhaps using the consortium idea. This may save some money, but would unlikely result in huge savings depending on how each would be structured administratively.
- Create a statewide entity that is representative of the role of a community college within the university system - University of Alaska Community College?
  - This would include career and technical (CTE) programs, tier one general ed. requirements, adult basic education, dual enrollment, apprenticeships, middle colleges, developmental studies, etc.
  - The CTCs and community campuses would serve as the 'front door' to the University of Alaska.
  - A streamlined administrative structure would have to be devised, and tier one offerings would bring in revenue to support the high cost of technical programs.
  - Again, a center of excellence model can be embedded in this structure to address ease of transition between programs and into 4-year degrees, reduce duplication where needed, and result in additional savings.
  - Other statewide colleges would still have the ability to offer courses/programs at community campus locations.
- Move CTE and Community Campuses out from under "academics" – there are libraries, student services, facilities, etc.
  - UAA is more aligned with the Chancellor than the Provost for reporting
  - Note that UAF reports to the Vice-Chancellor, with academic hires, course offerings and other academic matters to the Provost (dotted line)
  - UAA CTC is different – a dean reporting to the Provost all academic
  - UAS all reporting to the Provost
- Have local community campuses still be nimble, connected to community needs
  - Don't lose these capabilities
  - Work together to achieve whatever this model is going to be
- There are 16 career clusters in CTE and they are broad (including health, etc.) and there should be continued alignment around this
- Set aside how campuses are managed and focus on how academics are managed
  - A college of career and technical education
  - A separate university college on developmental education, adult basic ed, Tier 1 education, Trio Programs
  - A front-door at every campus
  - This would be competitive for the grants

Additional Discussion:
- Observation that there will be give and take – some offer upper division and some do not.
- Concerns that community campuses don't lose capability to offer courses toward degrees.

- Then organizational chart used in earlier budget talks is not necessarily the chart going forward.

Phase 5a: Consensus Recommendations
- *Needs further discussion:* A consolidated model where all community campuses and CTCs are under one unit
  - Preserve community campuses
- *Consensus:* Have central data on what is offered
- *Consensus:* Expanded access to courses across the system
  - Example of millwright program denied in one location because it exists in another, even if people would not travel to that location
  - Able to go to the students
- *Needs further discussion:* The career education and tech ed programs need to be treated in distinct ways
  - Two horizontal forums -- campuses (including GERs, student affairs, etc.) and CTE -- which could co-exist under a single structure
  - On a campus you are serving many needs, which is distinct from workforce programming
  - Comments:
    - This would work with the one accreditation model, but how would it work with the consortium model (more complicated in that it crosses accreditation line – though there are cases of sharing across accreditation lines)?
    - How does this work with arts and sciences?
    - Where are the OEs and other programs?
    - Needs definitions
- *Needs more discussion:* A model for consolidation with a focus on occupational endorsements, AA, OEs, and other matters – writing, math, tier 1 GER offered (not housed)
  - Note that UAA CTC and UAS Career ed are not a campus (they are on a campus)
- *Needs more discussion:* Model of UAS collaboration across three campuses as one school of Career Education
  - All faculty have to agree on all three campuses to launch a course

Phase 5b: Implementation Planning

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

Concluding Comments:
- Appreciation for the engagement by all
- This is one of many groups, faculty governance, students, staff, advisory groups and others who will be involved in the coming weeks

- It is not anticipated that there will be a specific recommendation on going to the board in September, but a plan for going forward with the aim of the November meeting.
- It is easy to put things in a box without attending to the differences within that box
  - There is great variety in this system
- An administrative structure exists to create value and mitigate harm
- The status quo can be improved upon to meet our mission better
- The economic climate has changed, including a reduction in state support
  - There is now a need to deal with change in the source of funding, including being less dependent on state support (which could be cutting budgets or growing revenue)
- How we respond is up to us
- This group has a large mission on enabling college-ready Alaskans
  - A key area of growth – revenue, interaction, and engagement
- There is a great deal of variation in how we can meet this mission
- Accreditation is a great excuse to prevent change, rather than working with it to meet our objectives and still meet the accreditation standards
- The board's directive was to prepare a strategic approach and there is time to do so
- There will be a plan to go forward
  - The consensus items here are one part of this conversation
  - Take what has been discussed in these intense sessions and carry these forward
- The short term impacts are real in terms of budget reduction, but there has to be a long-term strategic approach as well
- The community campus directors should certainly go forward with the October meeting, with things to happen leading up to that

Appendix:

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

Parking Lot
-