



UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA

Many Traditions One Alaska

Community Campuses Team Report

**(including Community and Technical College (CTC) at UAF & UAA,
and School of Career Education (SoCE) at UAS)**

UA Strategic Pathways

January 18, 2017



Table of contents

Charge, Scope and Goal.....	2
Brief Community Campus Background.....	3
Process Overview.....	4
Option 1 – Consolidation Under a Single New Stand-Alone Administration	5
Option 2 – Consolidation Under a Single Administration in an Existing University	8
Option 3 – Increased Integration with Regional Universities.....	10
Option 4 – Community Campuses Become Learning Centers	13
Option 5 – Create Community Campus Partnerships to Establish Tribal Colleges	16
Option 6 – Enhanced Collaboration and Alignment Among Community Campuses Across UA System.....	18
Opportunities for Change.....	21
Addendums	22

Charge

Develop and review options for organizational restructuring to include, but not limited to, consolidation under a single administration or increased integration with regional universities that support increased enrollment and student attainment in high demand career and technical education (CTE) fields, lower tuition rates, and other means as identified by the team.

Scope

Administration of community campuses (including Occupational Endorsement Certificate (OEC); Certificate and Associate programs).

Goal

System-wide goal: Meet 90% of projected labor market demand in career and technical education fields by 2025.

Key Stakeholders

- ▶ Students
- ▶ Faculty
- ▶ Staff
- ▶ Executive Leadership
- ▶ Communities
- ▶ Employers
- ▶ Parents
- ▶ Alumni
- ▶ Legislators
- ▶ K-12 System
- ▶ Industry, Government and Nonprofit Partners

Team Members

- ▶ Alesia Kruckenberg
- ▶ Luisa Machuca
- ▶ Paula Martin
- ▶ Saichi Oba
- ▶ Evon Peter
- ▶ David Russel-Jensen
- ▶ Tara Smith
- ▶ Michele Stalder
- ▶ Gary Turner



Brief Community Campus Background

In the 1980s, after the merger of the community campuses into one of the three universities, each university and campus responded to local and regional needs in different structural manners. UAS integrated its programs across all campuses (“one university, three campuses”) while UAF worked on different models and structures, ultimately creating a College of Rural and Community Development as the umbrella institution led by a vice chancellor. UAA’s community campuses were more independent, while UAA’s Community and Technical College was heavily integrated in the main campus.

Whatever their structure, community campuses mission goes beyond credit-bearing classes for Occupational Endorsement Certificates (OEC), and certificate and associate degree programs. These campuses deliver non-credit workforce development, professional development and personal development programs. Some community campuses offer four-year degrees while others have Ph.D. qualified faculty who teach upper division courses, helping to serve place-committed students. Community campus data does not reflect the contribution of providing access to all UA programs. If the program is not academically housed at the campus, the campus does not receive recognition for supporting the student through the program. Board of Regents policy recently defined that the purpose of community campuses was to prioritize local and regional workforce needs.



Process Overview

The Community Campuses 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, the Community Campuses team continued to define the options with weekly teleconferences and virtual collaboration. The Pros and Cons for each Option were developed in Session 2, which was rescheduled from early November to Community Campuses team's Session 2 December 15 -16, due to cancelled flights. Since then the Community Campuses team 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 – Consolidation Under a Single New Stand-Alone Administration

Narrative Description

This would establish a stand-alone Community Campus System housed under UA Statewide like the other three universities. This system would house all OEC, Certificate, and Associate's degree programs.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Would require Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) approval and substantive changes to regional and specialized program accreditation.
 - Could standardize program offerings.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Establish new major administrative unit.
 - Repurposing of staff and administrators from existing universities and additional new administrative staff.
 - Changing academic home of faculty.
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - Will need a home for administration.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Could improve recruitment through focused branding and communication.
 - Depends on articulation agreements and how the offering of upper-division courses/bachelor's programs is negotiated.
- ▶ Administration
 - Increased staff/administration support required.
 - New governance structure will be needed.
 - Increased long distance coordination cost.
- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - Pursue separate accreditation (2-3-year process), considerable costs.
 - Similar up-front costs to those described in the evaluation of single accreditation.
 - Major communication outreach required to Advisory Councils, local and state elected officials to explain changes.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - Potentially diluting of community engagement, could also damage existing partnerships.
 - Could expand network connections for community partners.

Option 1 continued – Consolidation Under a Single New Stand-Alone Administration

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ One major administrative unit focusing on CTE
- ▶ Focuses other universities missions more narrowly
- ▶ Opportunity for statewide collaboration
- ▶ Opportunity to reengineer processes and procedures
- ▶ Improved morale for the employees who see themselves a bit disenfranchised in current university system
- ▶ Could develop and implement some degree programs more quickly
- ▶ Clearer pathway to for students seeking 1 and 2 year programs
- ▶ Reduces competition amongst community campuses

Cons

- ▶ Major disruption and increase to staff, faculty, and administrative workloads from re-organizing to this model
- ▶ While re-organizing, reduced capacity to innovate and capitalize on other opportunities
- ▶ Could create more barriers to specific collaborations amongst universities and new major administrative unit
- ▶ Reduced morale for employees who value the integrated community college/ university mission
- ▶ Reduced enrollment for existing three universities
- ▶ Faculty and programs would be removed from some existing departments/colleges
- ▶ Increases competition for enrollments and student credit hours
- ▶ Potential for perception of community campuses not providing pathway to 4-year degree programs at universities
- ▶ Implementation timeline 3-5 years
- ▶ Workload increases from huge governance changes
- ▶ Dilutes community connection to the existing universities
- ▶ Some student support programs would need to be duplicated
- ▶ Stakeholders feeling of loss will be remembered at least as long as the merger has been



Option 1 continued – Consolidation Under a Single New Stand-Alone Administration

Cons, continued

- ▶ High difficulty to determine which integrated faculty and programs to move into the new major administrative unit (e.g., Do all UAA AAS health programs move? Which faculty move with the AA? Which faculty move with UAS Bachelor of Arts in Social Sciences?)
- ▶ For the universities that have integrated programs across their university and between all their campuses, significant gaps would exist for their program offerings
- ▶ Public perception of increased costs and increased administration of new organization

Option 2 – Consolidation Under a Single Administration in an Existing University

Narrative Description

This option would take all of the community campuses, including the CTCs (UAA and UAF) and SoCE (UAS), from each university and merge under an existing university. This would pull the Career and Technical educational mission into one of the three universities.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Major regional and specialized program accreditation impact, standardized program offerings.
 - Consolidation may increase system-wide CTE coordination and reduce duplication.
 - Lower tuition rates would require a subsidy so campuses do not operate with less funding compared to their current budgets based on current tuition rate.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Change in administrative staff. Potentially 278 faculty¹ affected (tenure home, workload, position reductions).
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - No net change expected.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Could improve recruitment through focused branding and communication.
- ▶ Administration
 - Changed layer of administrative processes and shifting of staff needed at the host campus.
 - Increased long distance coordination cost.
- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - High upfront cost (has some parallels to challenges of single accreditation).
 - Would need to review Responsibility Centered Management to reset allocations across service centers.
 - Major communication outreach required to Advisory Councils, local and state elected officials to explain changes.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - Potentially diluting of community engagement, could also damage existing partnerships.
 - Could expand network connections for community partners.

¹ UA in Review 2015

Option 2 continued – Consolidation Under a Single Administration in an Existing University

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ One university focusing on CTE
- ▶ Focuses other two universities missions more narrowly
- ▶ Opportunity for statewide collaboration
- ▶ Lead university would have benefit of increased matriculation to their schools
- ▶ Opportunity to reengineer processes and procedures
- ▶ Reduces competition amongst community campuses

Cons

- ▶ Major disruption and increase to staff, faculty, and administrative workloads from re-organizing to this model
- ▶ While re-organizing, reduced capacity to innovate and capitalize on other opportunities
- ▶ Reduced morale
- ▶ Implementation timeline 3-5 years
- ▶ Workload increases from huge governance changes
- ▶ Dilutes community connection to non-lead universities
- ▶ Increases competition for enrollments and student credit hours
- ▶ Stakeholders feeling of loss will be remembered at least as long as the merger has been
- ▶ Non-lead universities would see fewer matriculating students
- ▶ High difficulty to determine placement for which university gets the CTE leadership
- ▶ For the non-lead universities that have integrated programs across their university and between all their campuses, significant gaps would exist for their program offerings

Option 3 – Increased Integration with Regional Universities

Narrative Description

Increased integration means: budgets, faculty supervision, course and program offerings consolidated at university department-level, not at community campus level. This approach would further imbed the community campus mission into the broader university mission. This option would remove some programs housed at the community campuses and move them to departments at the regional home university. Programs unique to community campuses with adequate staffing to function as departments could remain as independent departments on the community campuses. Increased integration means budget, faculty supervision, scheduling, and support functions such as financial aid, registration, etc., would be at a regional university and would result in local campus layoffs; salary savings would need to pay for hiring new people at regional universities.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Programmatic control would be centralized at the regional university, often at a distance from the local needs; e.g., UAF- CTC and CRCD would lose up to 13 of their programs to UAF departments, including some of their highest performing and most effective programs.
 - Scheduling of courses, hiring of adjuncts and regular faculty. Course offerings would be limited to what the home university determined was necessary.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Reduced administrative positions at the local level. Increased need for staff within regional universities.
 - Reductions in staff and faculty at community campuses and a buildup in the departments of the regional university.
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - Will lead to increased need for adequate band-width for distance delivery.
 - Will limit the face-to-face offerings at remote sites.
 - Facility use might be reduced at community campuses or on the main campus through distance delivery.
 - Could result in decreased revenue to support facilities costs.
 - Could result in the reduced use of community campus facilities.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Will limit the face-to-face offerings at remote sites.
 - Departments will need support in order to meet student needs across the region.
 - Potential loss of access to faculty at the community campus level.
 - Student service functions would need to be integrated with the main campus (supervised by Student Affairs staff from the main campus) or be provided via distance to community campus students.
 - Regional scheduling could result in greater access to students.

Option 3 continued – Increased Integration with Regional Universities

- ▶ Administration
 - Campus directors would become coordinators/facility managers, with no direct supervision of community campus faculty. Their reporting lines would need to be determined.
 - Community campuses will have a reduced level of tuition revenue, in part because of new revenue sharing.
 - Increased administrative process to establish and maintain community partnerships.
 - Could be reduction in senior level leadership.
- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - Significant reallocation of staff and administrative workload and time to reorganize student service processes.
 - Requires a new culture and a great deal of change: must invest in many meetings with faculty and staff and community members as to how these changes affect them.
- ▶ Major communication outreach required to Advisory Councils, local and state elected officials to explain changes.
- ▶ Reduction in personnel will create the need for front-end investment to address the human resources implications.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - Increased administrative process to establish and maintain community partnerships.
 - Reduced capacity to build and maintain relationships.
 - Outreach to local governments, state elected officials and Advisory Councils would be lessened.

Option 3 continued – Increased Integration with Regional Universities

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ Potential for increased collaboration
- ▶ Increased coordination could result in more efficient use of resources
- ▶ Perception of cost savings due to senior administrative reductions
- ▶ Differences in faculty cultures between main campus and community campus may be ameliorated with potential for expanded scope of practice for faculty
- ▶ Improved morale for those who wish to be more integrated in their regional universities

Cons

- ▶ Loss of ability to be flexible and responsive to community needs
- ▶ Integrated department model may limit teaching assignments for community campus faculty
- ▶ Likely result in rural site students having access to fewer local (face-to-face) courses
- ▶ Scheduling of courses made by non-local administration could result in less choice of courses and offerings not based on community needs since the universities are not in the community campus area
- ▶ Regional scheduling coordination over a large university will be time consuming
- ▶ Limited benefit from administrative salary savings would likely be needed for the additional university staff
- ▶ This will not be embraced by local and state elected officials. Many still speak very negatively about the merger and how it has diluted the “community college mission”.
- ▶ Major negative morale issues; most of the staff, faculty, and community
- ▶ Differences in faculty cultures between main campus and community campus may be exacerbated
- ▶ Communities will feel disenfranchised
- ▶ Municipal and partner funding will be negatively impacted
- ▶ This will add an additional barrier of communication with community partners
- ▶ Facility maintenance and upgrading will be reduced due to loss of local tuition and fee revenue
- ▶ Loss of Title III revenue (ranges from \$3-\$10 million for UAF campuses)

Option 4 – Community Campuses Become Learning Centers

Narrative Description

This option would seek to reduce community campuses operations into community learning centers. The challenge in this option (as in many of the options under consideration) is how to meet the educational, training and service needs of communities with the limited footprint a learning center provides versus that of a community campus.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Convert community campuses to learning centers.
 - Community campuses would no longer house any academic or workforce development programs.
 - Courses would only be offered via distance delivery or occasional onsite adjunct faculty.
 - Move all programs out of CTC/SoCE to other academic homes.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Could reduce local staff and faculty.
 - Potential increase of staff/faculty at universities.
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - University-owned facility utilization rates may decrease, but increased demand for technology.
 - Increased bandwidth necessary.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Reduction of access to local face-to-face courses, programs, faculty.
 - Reduction of locally relevant courses.
 - Reduced comprehensive services at the local level.
 - Students with learning needs that are not well-addressed via distance will not be well-served.
- ▶ Administration
 - No Campus Directors or CTC/SoCE Deans.
 - Reduced administrative staff at community campuses and CTC/SoCE.
 - Increased administrative staff at universities.
- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - Dependent on the campus: mothballing, renting, or selling facilities, pay for faculty relocation per collective bargaining agreements and severance pay for faculty/staff not retained.
 - Increased administrative staff at regional universities.
 - Accreditation changes will be needed.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - Negative impact on communities, reduced capacity for community engagement and partnership.

Option 4 continued – Community Campuses Become Learning Centers

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ Perhaps community facilities could be shared (this was mentioned by some legislators last session) so campus(es) would not have high infrastructure costs
Many campuses are already using community facilities.
- ▶ Perception of cost reduction
- ▶ Would require new ways of thinking or innovation to meet community needs
- ▶ Would drive prioritized collaboration

Cons

- ▶ Will lose branch campus status for Department of Education and substantial Title III funding
- ▶ Alaska Native Serving Institution status, held by several community campuses, would no longer have access to targeted federal funding
- ▶ This option would require an extensive and costly analysis to ensure that important educational dollars, specialized program accreditations, and crucial industry and community partnerships were not unintentionally sacrificed
- ▶ Facilities not optimized
- ▶ Cost and availability of increased bandwidth
- ▶ Reduction of access to locally relevant courses, programs, and faculty
- ▶ Reduced student support at the local level
- ▶ Students with learning needs that are not well-addressed via distance will not be well-served
- ▶ High touch services will need to be prioritized
- ▶ Will diffuse the focus on career and technical education
- ▶ Will have disproportionately negative impact on rural and Alaska Native students
- ▶ Elected officials, Native Corporations and organizations would not be in favor
- ▶ Loss of jobs and economic impact
- ▶ High political cost
- ▶ Loss of community



Option 4 continued – Community Campuses Become Learning Centers

Further Analysis Needed

- ▶ Does this option entail moving all academic programs to the “home” campus?
- ▶ What criteria would be used to identify which community campuses are designated as learning centers?
- ▶ Is there a definition of learning center or best practice for designing such an operation?

Option 5 – Create Community Campus Partnerships to Establish Tribal Colleges

Narrative Description

Work with interested tribes and Alaska Native institutions to create tribal colleges in partnership with the appropriate community campuses.

Establish a high-level Alaska Native Advisory Board, including UA Board of Regents members to foster cross pollination of ideas and alignment, to support visioning, collaboration and partnership expansion. Tribal colleges present the opportunity to access new federal revenue streams and to deepen partnerships among UA, the State of Alaska, and Alaska Native institutions.

Takes an innovative step in educational approach by increasing access, opportunity, and revenue.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Seed the start of tribal colleges in partnership with select community campuses.
 - Increase capacity of existing Indigenous Studies and Alaska Native Studies programs.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Current staffing structure in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Rural, Community and Native Education at UAF could manage most of this workload.
 - One or two additional staff would greatly increase capacity to focus efforts on tribal college assessment and formation.
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - Increase efficient campus and community partner facility utilization.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Increased potential for federal support would increase recruitment, access, retention and completion rates for students, particularly for rural and Alaska Native students.
- ▶ Administration
 - Creation of high-level Alaska Native Advisory Board within UA system.
 - Over time, administrative changes would be expected.
- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - Considerable work required to establish accredited tribal colleges at selected campuses that would comprise a tribal system/consortium.
 - Realization of tribal partner investments will help with front end costs.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - Favorable acceptance in interested communities.

Option 5 continued – Create Community Campus Partnerships to Establish Tribal Colleges

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ Expand partnership with Alaska Native institutions
- ▶ Capitalize on tribal interest in self-determination of education and in partnership with UA rather than separation
- ▶ Access new federal and partner funding streams
- ▶ Takes an innovative step in educational approach by increasing access, opportunity and revenue
- ▶ Increased cultural relevancy, with increased recruitment, retention, and completion rates of Alaska Native and rural students
- ▶ Improved recognition of Alaska Native student needs
- ▶ Enhances K-12 pathway for rural and Alaska Native students to postsecondary education
- ▶ Increases cross-cultural understanding and appreciation
- ▶ Enhance capacity to revitalize Indigenous language and knowledge

Cons

- ▶ Long-term process
- ▶ Accreditation hurdles before reaching federal revenue potential
- ▶ Political and structural unknowns
- ▶ Increased competition if not well-integrated with UA
- ▶ Potential challenge for rural community infrastructure to handle increased student enrollment


Option 6 – Enhanced Collaboration and Alignment Among Community Campuses Across UA System

Narrative Description

This option would build upon the present community campus organizational and reporting structures at UAA, UAF and UAS. Potential opportunities may include: continuing integration among community campuses through regional shared administrative and student services, greater collaboration among the community campuses, CTCs, SoCE, and community/industry/agency partners, to expand student access and increase attainment of CTE credentials across the system and focus on the program-level rather than reorganizing institutional structures.

Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering
 - Through robust student and community needs analysis and broad program coordination, programs may increase access, expand delivery models, and coordinate schedules.
 - Programs offered in multiple locations having coordinated curriculum would allow for greater resource sharing among them.
 - Will be able to address customized or tailored education/training to respond industry needs with collaboration.
 - Will reduce redundancy.
- ▶ Staffing
 - Positions/workloads may be changed to meet community or programmatic needs. Could be shared among community/agency partners.
 - As budgets have been reduced, community campuses have strategically reduced staff and faculty.
- ▶ Facilities/Technology
 - May result in more efficiency in facility utilization rate.
- ▶ Access for Students
 - Expands opportunities at the local level.
 - Focuses on improving pathways from training and apprenticeship programs into higher education credentials.
 - Enhancement of “High Touch Services”.
- ▶ Administration
 - Cultural shift away from regional competition to enhance collaboration and cooperation.
 - Enhanced sharing of resources.
 - Recognition of the need for equity of resource allocation and evaluation expectations (e.g., equitable distribution of credit hours, student headcount and graduates).



Option 6 continued – Enhanced Collaboration and Alignment Among Community Campuses Across UA System

- ▶ Front-end Investment
 - Student needs analysis for targeted populations and/or programs, faculty coordination, professional development.
 - Creation of coordination teams.
 - Would require strategic investment funds.
 - Establish the mechanism for the equity of resource allocation and evaluation expectations.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
 - This approach enhances the current ability of programs to respond to community needs and collaborate productively across the state.
 - Increased collaboration outside regional boundaries.

Option 6 continued – Enhanced Collaboration and Alignment Among Community Campuses Across UA System

Pros and Cons

Pros

- ▶ Builds efficiency and academic collaboration in a short timeline
- ▶ Minimal increased cost
- ▶ Programs offered in multiple locations having coordinated curriculum would allow for greater resource sharing among them
- ▶ Likely strong political support and maintains local political good will
- ▶ Potential efficiencies
- ▶ Strong industry, organization, and agency support
- ▶ Focuses immediate effort and attention on goals of increasing student access and completion versus substantial organizational/structural change
- ▶ Most likely option to produce short-term gains in student attainment
- ▶ Supports collaboration and builds relationships across the state
- ▶ Maximizes student recruitment and retention
- ▶ Promotes and encourages faculty cooperation
- ▶ Shared responsibility for implementation
- ▶ Greater focus on expanding reach of CTE programs
- ▶ More inclusive system approach to increasing attainment of CTE credentials
- ▶ Greater access to specialized programs across the state

Cons

- ▶ Getting buy-in
- ▶ Determining how to equitably distribute student services resources, student credit hours, headcount, and graduates
- ▶ Challenge of completing a cultural change
- ▶ Deciding how to equitably distribute resources
- ▶ Distributed authority for implementation



Other Opportunities for Change

- ▶ Further explore lower tuition options to increase student access.
- ▶ Possible base funding instead of headcount for rural campuses.
- ▶ Incentives need to be considered (such as students served in any university's program/courses rather than only based on students served in campus program/courses).
- ▶ Expanded collaboration for unique programs (such as process technology, fisheries technology, tribal management ... these programs have interest at many campuses but are currently concentrated at only a few).
- ▶ Exclusive responsibility for developmental education - Further clarification needed to best use developmental education (look to Tiger Team report from last year).

Addendums

- ▶ Alaska Economic Trends. October 2016.
<http://labor.alaska.gov/trends/oct16.pdf>
- ▶ ANSI and Title III Eligibility Requirements 34 CFR Part 606.7(b) and 34CFR Part 607.7(e).
- ▶ Developing a Data-Driven University. Strategies and Best Practices for Increasing Reporting and Analytical Capacity to Improve Institutional Effectiveness. 2010.
http://www.nku.edu/content/dam/StrategicPlanning/docs/implementationteams/technologysupport/library/21067_UBER_Developing-a-Data-Driven-University.pdf
- ▶ University of Alaska Board of Regents Task Force Reports (Tiger Teams), 2015.
- ▶ University of Alaska, UA in Review 2016.
<http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/ir/reports/ua-in-review/uar2015/UAR-2016-Final.pdf>