

To: Chancellor Cathy Sandeen

From: Campus Planning Advisory Board (Beverly Shuford, John Stalvey, co-chairs)

RE: Campus Planning Advisory Board Report on Administrative Reviews

The charge of the UAA Campus Planning Advisory Board shall [be to] advise the Chancellor and resources which impact students, employees and/or community members UAA experience. CPAB will ensure fulfillment of the UAA strategic plan by reviewing and providing input on policy and resource decisions that are submitted to [the] Cabinet.

Our long term mission is to advise how the goals of our next strategic plan are met. However, this plan is still under development and we are faced with an extraordinary crisis. We have been given the ad hoc task to provide our perspective and advice on critical decisions regarding immediate and painful cuts to programs and services for those who must make them.

We have reviewed all twenty-one administrative reviews and the five recommendations based on them submitted by the appropriate Vice-Chancellors and Provost on March 5. However, lack of necessary data and time makes it extremely difficult to suggest specific cuts. We feel, therefore, the most useful thing we can do is to ask critical questions. These include, how might these cuts affect UAA as an institution going forward; what additional areas might prove fruitful of cost savings; and what ought an equitable, deliberate, data informed process for making future cuts look like? These we hope will inform the decisions of the Chancellor and her cabinet.

The underlying principle for these decisions must be what is the imperative of UAA? What is the value added proposition this institution provides the people of Anchorage and Southcentral Alaska? How can it be preserved? Our mission has three critical elements.

The success of our students in achieving their learning objectives.

The classes which faculty teach and the research faculty conduct and disseminate.

To make the benefits of the university equally available to all who wish it.

Alaska is not confined to UAA. A recent *New York Times* editorial referencing the research of Princeton economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton concluded.

opportunities. Graduates are more likely to be employed, earn more, marry and

However, we feel that a more thoroughgoing process needs to take a broader, institutional approach. We suggest several questions that might usefully be asked.

What prospects for costs savings and productive community partnerships might be achieved by outsourcing various functions rather than doing them in house?

What prospects for additional program support might be achieved by corporate sponsorships (especially those for whom we produce qualified graduates)?

What prospects for costs savings might be achieved by a vigorous partnership with the municipality of Anchorage or communities which host branch campuses?

How might administrative functions be combined within administrative and academic units by prioritizing the improved

Ideally, the process would begin with a thorough understanding of precisely what level of funding was necessary for the university to carry out the four functions listed above.

Adequate time must be provided for acquiring and analyzing necessary data. Time for thorough reflection, commentary, feedback and revision is vital to a legitimate process.

Burden sharing must be equitable (which is not the same as equal). Those suffering disproportionate burdens will inevitably feel resentful and alienated. Even more dangerous, however, is the sense of entitlement among those artificially spared such burdens.

Make clear what proportion of cuts are coming from academic programs, administrative functions within academic units, and administrative functions within administrative units.

A data informed process that looks beyond the individual silos of academic programs, colleges, or administrative units and focuses on the improvement of processes offers the possibility of realizing substantial savings and must be part of the planning process.

Criteria for making cuts, once established, must be adhered to.

An open, informed process, respectful of shared governance principles is vital for the process to retain legitimacy.

While the commitment to transparency is paramount, we are deeply concerned that the mere announcement that program and service cuts are contemplated will aggravate continuing trends of decline in student enrolments and tuition. The danger of slipping beyond the event horizon of a black hole in which declines in institutional reputation bring mutual declines in programs, enrollments, tuition, research funding, faculty, and staff which cannot be reversed is quite real and may, for all we know, already have been crossed.

The only viable path to avoid this fate are stable budgets which permit long term planning and leveraging resources for growth to proceed. Practices adopted must be sustainable over time to avoid the burn out of students, faculty, staff and administrators operating in constant crisis mode. And all of this must be in service to a shared vision of what UAA shall be once the crisis is passed and with a clearly articulated path to get there.

More than the mere promise of survival, what will inspire and sustain us is the assurance that there will be a future where we can once again dedicate ourselves to the task of making UAA the best institution it can be for the people of Anchorage and Southcentral Alaska.

Respectfully Submitted.

Campus Planning Advisory Board

Beverly Shuford, Co-Chair
John Stalvey, Co-Chair

