Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

A Comprehensive Evaluation Committee Report

University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, AK

October 4 - 6, 2010

A Confidential Report Prepared by the Evaluation Committee for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Evaluation Committee Roster

Dr. Elizabeth M. Street, Committee Chair, Professor of Psychology, Central Washington University, Ellensburg, WA

Dr. Sona Andrews, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Boise State University, Boise, ID

Dr. Diane L. Brimmer, Vice President for Student Development, Viterbo University, La Crosse, WI

Dr. Byron Burnham, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Vice Provost, Utah State University, Logan, UT

Dr. Muriel Oaks, Dean, Center for Distance and Professional Education, Washington State University, Pullman, WA

Dr. Shawn Smallman, Professor of International Studies, Portland State University, Portland, OR

Dr. Ronald L. Baker, Staff Liaison, Executive Vice President, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Redmond, WA

Table of Contents

Introduction

A six-member evaluation committee accompanied by a staff liaison from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (See Page 1 of this report for a complete list.) conducted an evaluation of the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) in Anchorage, Alaska on behalf of the commission. The committee submits this confidential report of its findings consistent with the requirements of a seven-year comprehensive review.

The Year Seven Report was submitted in a timely manner, and Mr. Thomas Miller and Ms. Megan Carlson, who oversaw the institution's preparation of the self-study and details of the visit, were extraordinarily helpful at every turn. The enthusiasm of the campus community about the planning and core theme processes was palpable, and the evidence obtained on campus verified that the report provided an accurate picture of UAA.

Quality of Self-Study and Supporting Documents

This Year Seven Report (i.e., the self study) was developed simultaneously with the evolution of the commission's reporting guidelines. Therefore, the institution was somewhat on its own in developing the report format, which explains why it is not entirely consistent with the format that is now available on the commission's website. The report provides institutional context as it relates to mission and planning; describes institutional planning; details planning and development related to the core themes; and provides an overview of mission fulfillment, adaptation, and sustainability. However, it is somewhat more difficult to follow the arguments for assessment and improvements related to each core theme. Numerous supporting documents were made available online, on a pen drive provided to each evaluator, in the work room, and in interviews with key staff, faculty, and administrators. While the report provided many of the facts related to UAA's compliance with the standards, the evaluation committee's conversations with faculty, staff, students, and administrators on the UAA campuses provided an even more vivid perspective of this dynamic and engaged institution.

Methods Used to Verify the Self-Study

Evaluation committee members carefully reviewed all supporting materials; toured campus facilities; and conducted interviews with numerous administrators, faculty, staff, and students as well as with Ms. Cynthia Henry, chair of the system-wide Board of Regents and with the president of the University of Alaska system, Mr. Patrick Gamble. A list of those who were interviewed is included in Appendix A. One member of the evaluation committee spent the large part of one day at Kenai Peninsula College and a second spent part of one day at Matanuska-Susitna College. In both cases, the committee members were able to talk with students, staff, faculty, and administrators at these sites that, along with Kodiak College and other distance locations, contribute considerably to UAA's mission fulfillment.

Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements 22-24

> *Student Achievement.* UAA publishes the expected learning outcomes for its degree and certificate programs and engages in regular and ongoing assessment to validate student achievement of these learning outcomes. As noted later in the report, there is some variation in the degree of thoroughness and elegance of the assessment programs across departments and colleges, but the institution is in compliance with this eligibility requirement.

Institutional Effectiveness. UAA has clearly defined evaluation and planning procedures that are embedded in a five-step management process. It engages in extensive assessment of institutional and core theme indicators, and it publishes the results of its assessment and evaluation protocols at least annually both in print and on the UAA website. Through the use of the Chancellor's Cabinet strategic guidance memorandums, it communicates to the campus changes in the internal and external environment that may influence the institution and its viability and sustainability.

Scale and Sustainability. UAA's management team keeps a watchful eye on human and financial resources and modifies infrastructure as needed to ensure that it can fulfill its mission and achieve its core themes now and into the future. The UA system maintains a reserve pool that is sufficient to protect all of its major administrative units against economic or enrollment downturns. That said, the UAA enrollment growth of the past few years has been extraordinary and has stretched faculty and staff resources. The institution will need to continue to monitor enrollment growth into the near future to ensure that faculty and staff resources are adequate to support it and to meet the institution's goals.

Standard 3.A—Institutional Planning

The University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has been engaged in a well articulated five stage management cycle that includes planning, adopting, implementing, performing, and refining. The evaluation committee was convinced, based on evidence presented in the self study and in campus conversations, that institutional planning is comprehensive, systematic, systemic, inclusive, and transparent. Planning is informed by state priorities, local projections of needs and resources, and a review of progress on existing goals. Although the institution stops occasionally to articulate and publish plans, for example *University of Alaska Anchorage Strategic Plan 2017 (*UAA 2017), planning at the institution is a continuous process. Even so, institutional planning is not entirely autonomous. As one of three major administrative units (MAUs) within the University of Alaska system (UA), UAA's planning is necessarily informed by system-wide planning.

There is one Board of Regents for the UA system. It develops policies and regulations that guide the planning process at both the system and MAU levels. According to UAA's Year Seven Report to the NWCCU, the regents work together with the system president to "set strategic goals that respond to the needs of the state, work to ensure that resources follow responsibilities, and guarantee the university system's responsiveness and accountability to the legislature and the people of the state." There is a clear expectation that the MAUs will collaborate in achieving statewide goals, and this has led to some friction among the campuses and between the board and UAA. For example, proposals initiated by UAA faculty and supported by UAA leadership for UAA to award doctoral degrees (a role currently reserved for the University of Alaska Fairbanks) are currently stalled because of system-wide resistance. Despite these occasional conflicts, however, UAA seems able to take its own lead within fairly broad parameters specified by the system and enjoys a great deal of statewide support as the largest of the three MAUs and because it is located in the state's population center.

Although it shares a governing board with the other MAUs, UAA has impressive and dedicated support from local advisory boards which not only contribute to the institution's planning process but also advocate for the institution's needs and priorities at the state level. The external perspective provided by highly visible members of local communities surrounding the UAA campuses is an important thread in the fabric of planning at UAA.

Planning is both informed by and tied to the annual budget cycle. It is clear that institutional priorities, as developed in the UAA 2017 plan and refined through the process of strategic guidance, drive resource allocations at the institution. At every turn, the evaluation team heard that both planning and budgeting processes were transparent and that decisions were based on institutional priorities rather than political winds or personalities. Further, faculty and staff alike hold the institution's leaders in high regard for their openness and willingness to listen to alternative points of view both in setting goals and in allocating resources.

UAA's leadership team agreed to serve as a pilot institution for the new NWCCU standards and process in a shortened time frame for several reasons. One factor that influenced their decision was the degree of planning that had just been completed with UAA 2017. They recognized that core theme development, planning, assessment, and improvement couldn't have come at a better time for them. They also welcomed the opportunity to stretch that serving as a pilot institution provided. Members of both the Accreditation Steering Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet acknowledged that it was a bit more of a stretch than they had anticipated, requiring an extraordinary commitment of resources—

most especially staff time. However, they also noted that they believe it was the right decision for them and that it has positioned them well to begin the "regular" seven-year accreditation process.

Beginning in 2008, UAA developed core themes and specified objectives and indicators related to each. In the speeded-up process, they also attempted to assess their effectiveness in meeting the indicators and to make plans for improvement when adequate progress was not achieved. A broadly representative faculty-chaired Accreditation Steering Committee led the campus through the process of identifying themes and then established teams for each of the resulting themes to ensure that outcomes and measurable indicators were identified and that outcomes were assessed and evaluated.

Though this process, the institution identified five core themes, all of which articulated nicely with UAA 2017 and the first three of which also overlapped system-wide goals.
- Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning
- Core Theme 2: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
- Core Theme 3: Student Success
- Core Theme 4: UAA Community
- Core Theme 5: Public Square

UAA was ambitious even for an institution that would have had seven years to achieve its goals, identifying more indicators than they were able to fully assess and evaluate. As a result, the response to the Year Five Report suggested the institution review its indicators and prioritize those that were most important to achieve in the near term. Further, the current evaluation team heard from the faculty, staff, and administration that several of the indicators had proved difficult to measure or that some measures that had originally been crafted weren't getting to the heart of the matter.

Even so, this is an institution that has a strong belief in assessment and evaluation. Its Office of Institutional Effectiveness maintains data on numerous variables in addition to those identified for the core themes. Some of the data are required by external bodies, for example, the UA system or IPEDS, and collection of some data is an artifact of history. However, institutional leaders are well aware of the glitches with some data and the work to refine measures continues and is collaborative with work going on in other institutions. One noteworthy example is the work of Dr. Gary Rice, associate vice provost, UAA Office of Institutional Research, whose work on developing a Student Learning Progress Model— based on a ten-year window and designed to address the limitations of the traditional student success metric—has drawn national attention. Similarly, when the institution discovered that counting its number of external partnerships wasn't getting to the core purpose of the outcome, they began to look for alternate ways to determine progress on the related outcome. This willingness to search for the right measure instead of making do with just any measure is very much in the spirit of NWCCU's revised standards and speaks to the commitment of UAA to getting it right.

Although UAA has targets or benchmarks for some of its indicators, for others it has none. This was troubling to the evaluation committee and was the topic of conversations with both the Accreditation Steering Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet. Regarding target setting, the chancellor and the provost said they were more interested in continuous improvement than in achieving an arbitrary marker. They also noted a tendency, when one is forced to set a target, to shoot low—select a target that is easily achievable. UAA wanted instead to stretch, to go as far as circumstances and effort would permit. Regarding benchmarks, they noted that UAA is, if not unique, at least quite different from most other comprehensive master's degree granting institutions. These differences make it difficult for the institution to identify peers who are operating under similar conditions. This in turn makes it challenging

to identify benchmarks for performance based on peer institutions. While the evaluation committee is generally sympathetic to the arguments, members felt that the institution would be better served by setting either targets or the slopes of the trajectory—either accelerating or decelerating—they wish to achieve. The committee applauds the institution's desire to stretch and suggests that one option might be to set a target range which is anchored on one end by the "realistic" estimate and on the other end by a more "aspirational" estimate.

A major force in the resource allocation process is the Planning and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC) which is broadly representative of the campuses. The PBAC is co-led by the provost and the vice chancellor for administrative services. Each spring, the co-chairs submit a packet of materials outlining the operating budget allocation process. Included are timelines for submitting requests and the schedule for budget presentations. In addition, the Chancellor's Cabinet develops and distributes a "strategic guidance" memorandum which provides an "updated, comprehensive summary of the UAA leadership team's assessment of current conditions, assumptions, and priorities to guide planning, budgeting, and management of financial resources, people, and infrastructure" (UAA Cabinet Strategic Guidance, 16 February 2010). This strategic guidance uses external and internal conditions of the moment to fine-tune priorities, to flag economic indicators, and to identify emerging programmatic needs of the region. The time that is devoted to the budget process, most especially the budget presentations, speaks to the seriousness with which resource allocation is undertaken at UAA. Further, there is abundant evidence that priorities—established in the strategic plan and fine-tuned by the strategic guidance provided by the Chancellor's Cabinet—guide decisions on resource allocation and application of institutional capacity.

UAA communicates its accomplishments to its constituents in a number of ways including publishing its annual *Performance* magazine. *Performance '10,* the most recent in the series, is approximately 100 pages long and includes two parts. The first part reviews the year's highlights related to each of the five core themes and includes sections on "People" and "Looking Ahead." The second part details progress on key performance measures. The publication is available online and in print. In addition, the websites of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the Office of Institutional Research, and other campus units provide a rich source of data about the institution as well as reports that interpret the data.

As described in more detail related to Core Theme 4: The UAA Community, UAA has taken very seriously the requirement for emergency planning. In the communities of which UAA is a part, the number of emergencies one must plan for is staggering: earthquakes, volcanoes, tsunamis, blizzards, and attacks by wildlife to name just a few. Campus security and the Campus Response Team have laid out contingency plans that would allow operations to continue without significant interruption even in the somewhat inhospitable circumstances for which UAA must prepare.

Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning

Description of Core Theme

Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning (CT1) is noted in the institutional report as having long been the core pursuit of both the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) and the University of Alaska (UA) system and indeed, the team found a strong commitment to this core theme. The primary objective for the Teaching and Learning core theme states "faculty and curriculum support achievement of relevant student learning outcomes." This objective is supported by three outcomes:

- Students achieve learning outcomes.
- Curriculum meets relevant standards and state needs.
- Faculty use effective teaching methods.

The outcomes, in combination, reference ten institutional indicators.

Because the institution does not currently offer doctoral programs, nor does it have a wide array of graduate programs, undergraduate education is at the core of the institution's mission. The UAA has the largest enrollment of the three major administrative units in the state system and has experienced significant growth in enrollment in recent years. A large percentage of its students enrolls part-time, and there is a wide range of teaching environments within the institution from its community campuses to the Anchorage campus. This places a special burden on planning, implementation, and assessment to take account of the diverse contexts in which teaching and learning takes place.

Standard 3.B—Core Theme Planning

UAA has incorporated teaching and learning into its planning cycle at a variety of levels, such as faculty evaluation, assessment, and program review. Overall, there has been significant effort to create planning cycles around teaching and learning. UAA is completing a two-year cycle of program review during which all units will be reviewed. Once this process is complete, the institution plans to return to a more typical five-year program review cycle. As part of this process every unit is provided with detailed information from institutional research, after which they are required to write a self-study that responds to these data. Deans then review this material and decide which programs need further review. This process has enabled a large number of programs to undergo review in a defined period of time, while identifying a portion of programs for a more thorough examination.

The importance of learning outcomes is reflected in both the curricular and program review process. The department chairs were clear that all programs have such learning outcomes, and the program review process ensures this. Similarly, the curricular review process ensures that learning outcomes are clearly stated on the syllabus for each course. Overall, the UAA planning process is designed to ensure that learning outcomes are in place at the course and program level.

In the past, departments have completed their assessment work at the end of the academic year. This material was then reviewed, and the departments received written feedback. The consensus was that departments needed time to work on assessment over the summer, and that a more interactive discussion of the results would be valuable. The recent shift in the deadline for departmental assessment to October, together with the planned face-to-face communication of assessment results on a three-year basis, should represent a significant improvement in the planning cycle for assessment.

Although efforts to improve teaching and learning generally appear to be well integrated into the planning process, one exception may be found with the Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence (CAFE). While CAFE's colleague-to-colleague approach to faculty development has proved successful, to date the center has not been integrated into planning efforts either with regard to the definition of CT1's indicators or in planning to achieve targets. Despite CAFE's many strengths, its distance from these discussions creates an apparent disconnect in the planning related to teaching and learning, as well as the use of assessment results to inform key activities in this area (Standard 4.B.1.b, and 3.B.2). CAFE's role in faculty development is important given UAA's outcome number three for the teaching and learning core theme: "Faculty use effective teaching methods."

Standard 4.A—Assessment

UAA has taken a number of positive steps concerning assessment. First, UAA created a new Faculty Senate committee—the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC)—to oversee this work. This group has made considerable progress toward creating an assessment handbook. Second, the summer working group of the AAC and the Office of Academic Affairs undertook a significant assessment project to demonstrate that students satisfactorily achieve learning outcomes. A review of the website "2010 Academic Assessment Reporting" reveals that data not only are being collected, but also that departments are receiving constructive feedback on their work. Last, faculty commented that there appeared to have been a "culture shift" in the faculty's attitude toward assessment, with a significant percentage of faculty embracing assessment as a core feature of academe.

The university collects data on the ten indicators that it has chosen to evaluate CT1. For example, UAA commissions a graduate survey from a private research firm. This study is well-done, and provides considerable data to inform goal setting for teaching and learning, as well as to facilitate the work of the career center to meet the Teaching and Learning outcome for graduate employment, as mandated by Outcome 2. "Curriculum meets relevant standards and state needs."

Overall, UAA continues to make progress to show that it "engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable and verifiable data –quantitative and/or quantitative, as appropriate to the indicators of achievement- as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives." (Standard 4.A.1)

> **Concern**. Not all units have taken part in assessment efforts at the institutional level, in particular the School of Engineering and the College of Business and Public Policy. (See the Year Seven Report, Chapter Four, p. 9, as well as the assessment results on the 2010 UAA Academic Assessment Reporting website). Assessment efforts in the School of Engineering have focused on meeting ABET requirements. While this work is significant, the school should also participate in institutional assessment, and these data should be included on the UAA Academic Assessment Reporting website. It is true that UAA has access to data from program accrediting agencies, but this is not the same as having all schools and colleges represented in institution-level assessment and review. Departments that undertake assessment for professional accrediting bodies should also take part in larger university efforts to ensure coordinated efforts to improve student learning and success. Similarly, the College of Business and Public Policy's preliminary assessment reports were not available for academic year 2010 and for the review that took place in the past summer, even though the college had participated in institutional review in the past. The university is encouraged to follow through with its plans to have the college submit these data for review and to report them on the assessment website. Greater

transparency would result and would facilitate campus-wide planning and integration as well as the use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning across campus. It would also be in keeping with the holistic intent of this core theme. (Standards 4.A.5 and 4.B.2)

Standard 4.B—Improvement.

The university has made significant progress in this area, and efforts to improve teaching and learning generally appear to be well integrated. The academic boards require course learning outcomes to be stated on syllabi. Program learning outcomes are also communicated through syllabi, as well as websites. Department chairs also indicated that they are "closing the loop," and using assessment data to reshape curriculum. Still, UAA has not been as thorough and successful in demonstrating that departments are using data to change practice as it has been in showing that assessment is taking place and the results are communicated.

One challenge is that there is a perception that many faculty and staff within UAA may not be aware either of the nine long-standing general education (GE) learning outcomes or the newly created institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). Faculty and staff may therefore be less likely to prompt students about these expectations. Furthermore the ILOs seem to have been developed with haste, and conversations with faculty suggest they may need further discussion or refinement. These issues are important because students more successfully integrate material and take responsibility for their own education when they are aware of their learning outcomes. It is true that expectations around learning outcomes are part of the planning and curricular process. Nonetheless, further communication with multiple campus constituencies regarding the GE learning outcomes and ILOs may be needed to facilitate continued improvement in student achievement (Standard 4.B.1.c).

Faculty on more than one campus also commented on challenges related to the Individual Development and Education Assessment (IDEA) survey. The common concern was that the response rates were so low in many classes that it was challenging to use the results for improvement. Some faculty outside the Anchorage campus were particularly concerned because their classes were relatively small, which made it very difficult to use this measure as a valid instrument for faculty evaluation, as well as to improve instruction. This is important because this tool is a significant component of the current faculty evaluation process for promotion and tenure, and it will remain so despite planned changes to the promotion and tenure process. Both faculty and students expressed a strong interest in having the choice to implement this survey in paper format in class instead of electronically, because in-class administration would improve response rates. Notwithstanding this concern, once UAA addresses the problem of response rates, the IDEA survey appears to be a significant tool which gathers useful information that can improve instruction and serve multiple constituencies.

Core Theme 2: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Description of Core Theme

Core Theme 2 (CT2) addresses the related university functions of research, creative activities, and scholarship. CT2 takes a wide view of research so as to be inclusive of efforts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and also includes creative endeavors in the arts and scholarship in the humanities. Efforts in this core theme are centered upon the context of UAA and seek to understand the social, health, and natural environments of Alaska. Additionally, UAA understands the educational value of this core theme.

Specifically, the objective for this core theme states, "Research, scholarship, and creative activities advance knowledge and enhance learning." Three outcomes are specified related to the objective:

- Faculty, research professionals, and students inform, challenge, and entertain through research, scholarly, and creative projects.
- Students develop their capabilities in inquiry, expression, and invention.
- Research, scholarship, and creative activities attract support and resources to increase opportunities.

Seven indicators are specified through which to measure progress on these outcomes.

3.B—Core Theme Planning

In the larger system, context planning for core theme programs is influenced by the Regents' system-wide role that directs formation and dissolution of colleges, centers, institutes, and programs and the construction, modification and renovations of facilities. (Year Seven Report, Chapter 3, Section 1, Page 3).

In the specific context of CT2, planning was inclusive of all disciplines. Faculty from the arts, humanities, and other disciplines not usually involved with research were involved and had voice in planning efforts related to this theme. Additionally, the Honors College was involved in the planning effort. Faculty noted that planning for CT2 was initially heavily influenced by the science model. However, faculty who served on the CT2 evaluation team noted spirited discussion and debates that lead to a broader view of research to include performances, lectures, and other scholarly activities.

The planning process for CT2 proved valuable for UAA. It revealed, for example, that data collection related to this core theme is limited for the arts and humanities and is not as well defined as it is for research activities. Although the institution's comprehensive report didn't mention it, faculty and administrators also noted that research, creativity, and scholarship have a direct impact upon other core themes, particularly the public square (CT5), teaching and learning (CT1) and student success (CT3). The challenge is in reporting in such a way that impacts from one core theme can be recognized and formally valued in other core themes.

Related to planning for CT2 is a set of activities that are ancillary to the NWCCU accreditation effort. Planning for CT2 has moved into the university's budgeting processes and into work assignments. It is also part of annual reviews. (See, for example, *Performance '08, Performance '09*, and *Performance '10* reports.)

There is a growing institutional recognition that planning and measuring affect budgeting. While it appears to be less than even across the university, it is none-the-less becoming an institutional norm and is affecting the way planning takes place.

The deans and the faculty reported that there was wide faculty involvement in the planning process. The president of the Faculty Senate noted that he felt the importance and value of the accreditation activities was not so much in the data that were being collected, but rather in the conversations it had generated. Faculty members reported the process was open with multiple opportunities to offer feedback to committees who were deeply involved in development of objectives, outcomes, and indicators for the core themes.

Members of the Full Council of Deans and Directors indicated that the budget process references the core themes. Further, the College of Arts and Sciences uses core themes including CT2 to guide hiring decisions. There was also evidence that the planning process included continuous improvement activities at the college level. Department chairs noted that the assessment process has helped align planning, values, and indicators. They also noted that many programs have been reviewed by their professional accrediting associations and that there was increasing alignment between them and the NWCCU accreditation process.

This integrated planning seems to come from the history of strategic planning in place at UAA. In fact, CT2 is traceable to university values that had been articulated prior to this accreditation cycle. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities accreditation process has enhanced the importance of research, scholarship, and creative activities and increased the value of previously collected data.

In responding to the NWCCU standards, indicators that had been used in the past and had a long and rich history of data to measure UAA's progress in this core theme were included with more recently articulated indicators which have not yet been measured or measured as well. Overall CT2 planning provides direction to fulfilling the UAA mission by guiding allocations of resources toward research, scholarship, and creative activities. However, meetings with faculty and others indicated that this effort is somewhat distorted by measuring and reporting only those indicators—"cabinet" or "institutional" indicators—that are easily measured and deemed important in terms of increased income potential. The result is unevenness in the university profile supplied by these indicators. For example, in Core Theme 2 "Research, Creative Activities, and Scholarship," UAA lists three outcomes and seven indicators of which only two indicators were measured and both of those were under one outcome; this left two of the three outcomes unmeasured. Some of those interviewed suggested that indicators listed as priorities by the cabinet were chosen because data related to them were already available in UAA's reporting systems prior to the current NWCCU accreditation.

Faculty and staff indicated that another reason that some indicators were given higher priority is that they have budgetary implications for the university. Having said this, it is important to note that the chancellor and provost view cabinet indicators as the "first generation" indicators. They recognize that data on the remaining indicators are needed to complete the picture of UAA. The designation of cabinet/institutional indicators was also an attempt at focusing the large number of indicators as per suggestions from previous NWCCU evaluators.

Planning for CT2 achieved some impressive results according to the faculty. One faculty member noted "it [CT2] has integrated research into the fabric of the university." Another noted that previously laboratories were labeled as "upper division instruction" rather than as research labs. That has changed

in the past 3 or 4 years. Yet another faculty member noted "I've been here for 25 years and have been frustrated [about the role of research at UAA.] The last 5 years have been wonderful." This institutional planning approach for CT2 has been effective and has made a difference at UAA.

Planning for and articulating the CT2 indicators has also resulted in better integration of data and made it easier to respond similarly to questions about research, scholarship, and creative activities when they appear in professional accreditation standards. Now, data are more readily available to be used for multiple purposes.

Resources are allocated to address the outcomes of CT2, and development of this core theme has also influenced hiring. Traditionally faculty members were hired with a bipartite job description for teaching and service. Recently, more faculty members have been hired with a tripartite job description for teaching, research, and service. Faculty and institutional leaders anticipate that this trend will continue.

In summary, UAA does look at the work in CT2 holistically and does regard it in terms of core theme objectives.

4.A—Assessment

UAA's evaluation of two indicators related to Core Theme 2 objectives was well planned and involved faculty and administrators in an open process involving a wide range of faculty in all disciplines. However, only two of the seven indicators for this theme were measured, leaving two of the three core theme outcomes unmeasured. Those that were chosen for measurement and analysis came from among a larger set of institutional indicators and were noted as "cabinet" or "priority" indicators. While cabinet members engaged in a thoughtful process to establish priorities, some faculty felt those measures were chosen because data related to them had been gathered during earlier assessment activities and because these two indicators provided information that could set the stage for increased revenue for the institution. It is important to note that collection and analysis of data are considered "preliminary and tentative" (UAA Comprehensive NWCCU Report, Chapter 4, p. 3) for this core theme and to remember the very short timeframe within which UAA completed the accreditation cycle.

Faculty involvement is evident through the existence and use of a faculty peer review committee that evaluates new plans and in reports submitted annually by programs. The peer review committee makes suggestions for improvements. Last year 71% of academic programs had outcome assessment plans on file with the Office of Academic Affairs. UAA has engaged in a several year process of reporting institutional performance annually in a publication by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the most recent of which is *Performance '10*.

The data used by UAA to evaluate CT2 institutional indicators provided an institutional perspective of faculty workload in terms of research, service, and teaching as described in workload agreements. Data revealed that the majority of faculty devotes about 20 percent of their workload to research, scholarship, and creative activity for an institutional total of about 67 FTE. However, when the total number of tenure and term faculty (617) is used to compute the percentage of faculty with a research workload (69.9 percent) the percentage is only about 11 percent institution-wide (UAA Year Seven Report, Appendix 4, Unit Profile Datasets, p. 2)

Faculty reported they believe research, creative activities, and scholarship will play an increasingly important role in the workloads of faculty members. This area is perceived as an institutional priority.

While some faculty reported being pleased with the ability to include activities related to this core theme as part of their workload plans, others reported being frustrated that they could not.

UAA used data from CT2 in discussions among faculty groups and administrators to create services in one critical area for this theme. Evaluation of CT2 demonstrated that sponsored research had recently decreased, and an analysis showed that fewer proposals were being submitted. As a result, faculty development in the form of pre-proposal support has been increased with the expectation that the sponsored research will improve to and surpass previous levels. Although targets were not apparent, the analysis provided comparative data (i.e. a decrease from the previous year) which will allow UAA to set some intermediate and future goals (i.e. an increase in the number of proposals written).

The provost reiterated that the designation of some institutional indicators as cabinet or priority indicators was in response to the Year Five Report recommendation and was not intended to indicate that they have greater or lesser importance. Rather, he sees the other indicators as equally important to a full accounting of progress on CT2 and looks forward to getting on with this work.

4.B—Improvement

Even though data were collected on only a subset of indicators related to only one of three outcomes, there is evidence that the data were used to change practices and to achieve improvements. For example, the data on one indicator revealed a reduction in sponsored research dollars coming into the university. As a result, actions have been taken to strengthen pre-proposal support for faculty in areas such as proposal writing, budget development, and grant administration with the expectation this will increase sponsored research at UAA.

All Core Theme 2 outcomes were designated as "sufficient" in the self study (UAA Comprehensive Year Seven Report, Chapter 4, pp 6 & 17.) However, both in the report and in conversations on campus, it was clear that some indicators were only partly measured or not at all.

Outcome 1: Faculty, research professionals, and students inform, challenge, and entertain through research, scholarly and creative projects. For this outcome, faculty research publications are measured but creative projects and other scholarly activities are not. And even so, the data on faculty publications is incomplete in some colleges. The institutional report indicates that "additional information, such as the number of events, participants, and attendees will be captured in the future." The other two indicators of Outcome 1 ("Perceptions of those attending lectures, presentations, and performances" and "Impact of community-engaged research projects") were not measured. To the point, however, the data that have been collected for Outcome 1 is insufficient to substantiate a finding of sufficiency.

Outcome 2: Students develop their capabilities in inquiry, expression, and invention. Data were provided regarding a strong Honors program that deeply effects the students involved. Numbers of filled seats and degrees earned are reported. However, other data are either missing or not reported. It was noted achievement of this outcome via courses will be mapped in the future and that "Additional effort is needed to compile these data in all colleges and research units." (Year Seven Report, Chapter 4, Page 17). At the end of the day, however, limited or no data were found for this outcome and thus information on improvements was also unavailable.

Outcome 3: Research, scholarship, and creative activities attract support and resources to increase scholarship. As noted earlier, this outcome received the most extensive analysis in this assessment because two of its three indicators were measured. Further, the institution was able to provide evidence of actions taken to improve progress.

In the summary section of the evaluation of Core Theme 2 in UAA's NWCCU Year Seven Report, the first two outcomes were noted needing more work, yet progress was noted as sufficient. The evaluation committee suggests that a more accurate designation would be "weak" or "in progress." Further, because limited data were available, the institution was hard pressed to discuss how assessment had been used to improve progress toward achieving the outcomes. Having concluded the above, it is important to reiterate that, as a pilot school, UAA completed the NWCCU assessment cycle that is planned for a seven year time period in just a little over two years. This compressed cycle made it challenging for UAA to gather enough data to completely evaluate progress on its outcomes.

> **Concern.** Assessment of Core Theme 2 is limited to only two of seven indicators and on only one of three core theme outcomes. The evaluation team encourages the institution to develop a more complete and accurate picture related to CT2 by ensuring that one or more indicators related to each outcome is measured. (4.B.1)

Core Theme 3: Student Success

Description of Core Theme

Core Theme 3: Student Success (CT3) reflects a long-standing core value of the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) and of the University of Alaska (UA) system. Two objectives set the course for CT3:

- Success is demonstrated through student access, transition, persistence, and achievement of goals.
- Engagement enhances student quality of life and learning.

The objectives specify five outcomes, four for the first objective and one for the second:

- Alaska's diverse people become UAA students.
- Undergraduate students successfully transition into and complete their first year of college.
- Students make satisfactory progress toward and achieve their academic goals.
- Students benefit from the certificates and degrees they earn.
- Students are engaged in their campus and external communities.

Twelve indicators are identified to measure progress on the five outcomes.

3.B—Core Theme Planning

When asked about opportunities for input on core themes, one UAA student affairs professional responded, "We have input; the people who lead us listen and are proud of us." Several drafts were shared with student affairs professionals for feedback. From there, it was explained, feedback from collaborative discussions advanced to UAA upper-level administration and UA system officials.

Clearly, the core theme of student success was developed after much discussion across UAA. Student affairs professionals from academic and multicultural services, enrollment management, and student life units spoke of a shared effort including brainstorming, drafting, and redrafting mission and core themes. Staff members also told of frequent conversations related to aligning the core themes with mission, strategic plan and university system priorities at regularly scheduled meetings and annual staff retreats, among other venues.

The objectives, outcomes, and indicators for the core theme of student success are closely linked to this item shown in the UAA's mission statement: "discovering and disseminating knowledge through teaching, research, engagement, and creative expression." Because its outcomes and indicators are focused on increasing the number and percent of Alaskans attending UAA, becoming a portrait of Alaska's racial and ethnic diversity, and ensuring that both students and the state benefit from the education offered by the university, the core theme of student success is also connected with the UAA mission statement's focus on serving "the needs of the state, its communities, and its diverse peoples," being an "open access university" and working in a "rich, diverse, and inclusive environment."

Student success is a top priority for both UAA and the UA System. In the *University of Alaska Anchorage Strategic Plan 2017,* student success is included as a core value. The objectives, outcomes, and indicators chosen for the core theme of student success are directly related to these goals found in the strategic plan:

- *Work with school districts to increase the UAA share of Alaska college-bound students and improve student transition to higher education with special attention to Alaska natives and other underrepresented populations, and first-generation college students;*
- *Assure that open access leads to enhanced opportunity by continuing to improve out rates of retention and completion of educational goals;*
- *Improve the efficiency with which students navigate our programs and campuses from entry to completion…* (p.3).

In the UA system's strategic plan, student success is listed as goal number one.

Two documents – the Student Affairs *FY10 Operating Budget Request* and UAA's *Strategic Enrollment Management Plan FY09-13* – illustrate that planning and budgeting for all student affairs areas (i.e. academic and multicultural student services, enrollment management and student development) is directly tied to the university's emphasis on student success. The *FY10 Operating Budget Request* illustrates a thoughtful and collaborative review process for requesting the funds necessary for student affairs operations to advance UAA's core theme of student success. The document is a clear demonstration that funding priority is given to projects that have positively influenced and/or will have a favorable impact on student learning and retention.

The *Strategic Enrollment Management Plan FY09-13* says, "We've strengthened our assessment and advising strategies, increased our residential learning community options, and initiated new academic support and transition programs. Our rising retention rates are due to the cumulative impact of all these strategies" (p.18). More specifically, these initiatives are reported in the plan as having a positive effect on student success and retention: increasing opportunities for 24/7 online service access, strengthening commuter student services, coordinating customer service training for staff members, improving course scheduling and class capacity, offering computerized placement testing, employing Student Success Coordinators to assist freshman students in the largest colleges, coordinating regular meetings of the Academic Advising Committee, upgrading advising technology, expanding supplemental instruction, offering a greater number of freshman success seminars, improving orientation programs and addressing quality of life and engagement through voter registration and counseling services.

4.A—Assessment

This quote describes the use of data in enrollment planning (of which success and retention planning is a part): "Strategic Enrollment Management is a data-driven approach that uses a wide range of data sources to inform decision-making. We are continually refining the kinds of data we need to collect, and the best ways to present that data to executives so that they can make effective use of it. The problem is mostly one of volume and selectivity. If we collect too much information, it can be hard to determine what is most relevant. On the other hand, if we present only summary data, then it's not detailed enough to see exactly where to direct our attention and resources. Finding the balance is an on-going process and we expect to continually modify and adjust our data presentation capabilities in the years ahead" (*Strategic Enrollment Management Plan FY09-13*, p.24). Data collected to measure student success includes: retention rates, retention and persistence rates for special populations such as Alaska Native students, under-represented minority students, UA Scholars and part time students, placement test scores, course completion and course attrition data, grade point averages, certificate and degree completion rates, graduation efficiency indexes; and information from the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, Student Opinion

Surveys and the UAA Alumni Career Survey. Much of the aforementioned data is available on the university's web site.

UAA is steadily moving in the direction of comprehensive assessment related to the core theme of student success and retention. Many institutions would rely heavily on freshman retention rates and six-year graduation rates to define student success. These achievement indicators selected for the student success core theme outcomes and objectives are appropriate and provide a broader view of student success at UAA: percent of Alaska high school graduates enrolling in UAA immediately after high school and before age 21, percent increase in Alaska Native and American Indian enrollments, minority group enrollments increasing at a faster pace than same group growth in the general population, passing grades received by first year students, achievement of student's own goals, participation in campus life or community service activities, number of internships, engagement, etc.

In telling of campus efforts related to student success, one student affairs professional explained that, "Everything we do is deliberate and based on student needs and assessment." Another said, "Everyone is here for the same reason; to have an impact on students." Specific examples of student success initiatives and the instruments and/or methods used to measure them are provided here.

- The Advising and Testing Center utilizes student tracking, comment cards, focus groups, surveys, review of processes, learning outcomes, and Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Standards to evaluate and assess.
- The Learning Resource Center director analyzes usage of services for services offered particularly in the Reading and Writing Center, the Learning Skills Lab, the Language Lab and the Math Lab. She says, "We have a good way of tracking data for each area. We can break down by classes to see which ones students are coming from." Tools used for assessment and program evaluation in the Learning Resource Center are student learning outcomes for tutors, comment cards, feedback from faculty, the *Student Satisfaction Inventory*. Program evaluation and outcomes assessment will be further improved with the installation of Tutor Track, a program that links with university information systems, to provide information on grade, classroom success, and retention. The center director explained that tutors who are College Reading and Learning Association certified help the center with its success.
- UAA Disability Support Services uses responses to the *Student Satisfaction Inventory*, *Student Voice*, the *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE),* the *Learning and Study Skills Inventory* and an advising survey to assist in planning.
- To help provide a living learning environment conducive to study, Residence Life pulls data from participation in educational and social programs, safety and security data, facilities usage, relevant items on the *Student Satisfaction* Inventory and the student conduct database. Staff members in Residence Life are analyzing disciplinary sanctions to determine if learning occurred as a result of them.

Assessing and evaluating student success occurs less formally as well. Improving student success and making improvements to related policy, procedure, and programs is discussed regularly at student affairs staff meetings on the Anchorage campus. Visits to MSC and KPC revealed that similar discussions are regularly held there as well. The Advisory Council for Enhancing Student Success (ACCESS) is also involved in frequent discussion of and ongoing improvements to activities designed to promote student success.

4.B—Improvement

The results from core theme and program evaluations were the impetus for these student success-related initiatives on the Anchorage campus and at Matanuska-Susitna College.

- A Quick Start program at Matanuska-Susitna College allows first time freshmen with lower scores to retake placement tests after a summer "brush up" program.
- The Map Works program will be utilized on the Anchorage campus to gain greater knowledge of student skills and interests, to improve academic advising, and to strengthen student involvement in co-curricular activities.
- Various academic units on the Anchorage campus are employing success and retention coordinators for the purpose of improved advising, outreach, and support.
- Student information advisors are employed at the one-stop center on the Anchorage campus for improved customer service.
- Matanuska-Susitna College information sessions are providing incoming students with a better understanding of college procedures, more time to complete required enrollment procedures, and a greater sense of confidence at the start of one's collegiate career.
- The *Learning and Study Skills Inventory* is utilized at the Advising and Testing Center on the Anchorage campus to improve new student advising and to make appropriate referrals based on skill level and interests.
- The job responsibilities for those serving in admissions and recruitment on the Anchorage campus were redefined to build on employee strengths.
- A desk area renovation made after close review of foot traffic in the Anchorage campus Learning Center has resulted in an environment more conducive to skill building and learning.
- New student orientation programs are offered at Matanuska-Susitna College in response to survey feedback from students and families.
- The Degree Works degree audit and planning program has been available since 2009 to help students create a detailed academic course completion plan.
- The UAA registration web page and related forms were redesigned for quicker navigation and completion.
- A position in career services was created at Matanuska-Susitna College after review of student survey information.
- Matanuska-Susitna College employs student ambassadors to assist with outreach to incoming students before, during and after information sessions and new student orientation.
- In 2008, permanent funding was made available for the position of coordinator of the Alaska Native and Rural Outreach program.

While program evaluation is required, the units focused on the core theme of student success are in various stages of developing student learning assessments. (Please note that the evaluation committee member reviewing student success visited only the Anchorage campus and Matanuska-Susitna College. This is the reason for student success examples from only these locations.)

Core Theme 4: UAA Community

Description of Core Theme

The objective of Core Theme 4 is to provide an environment within the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) that is supportive and sustainable for learning, working, and living. This includes the facilities and resources needed to attract, support, and sustain the people and programs that advance knowledge, skills, and competencies and those that serve the needs and interests of students in the internal UAA community. UAA describes this core theme as one that creates a campus that is diverse and inclusive, supportive and sustainable, and fiscally responsible.

Four outcomes are articulated for this core theme:
1. UAA campuses are safe.
2. Faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds are satisfied and prosper in their professions.
3. Facilities and campus services at each campus support learning, working, and living.
4. Programs and services incorporate sustainable practices.

Eleven indicators are identified to measure progress on achieving the outcomes.

It is clear that there is a great sense of community at UAA. Faculty and staff all comment positively about the sense of community, camaraderie, and the positive working environment at UAA.

Standard 3.B—Core Theme Planning

There is clear evidence that there has been and continues to be wide level campus participation in the development of this core theme. There is tremendous buy in and significant planning is taking place. Individuals feel that the core theme emerged as a result of the work that everyone was doing and most units report that Core Theme 4 incorporates much of their activities. Individuals also talk about the positive effect that the core theme has had on the work their units are doing. Many feel that the core theme serves as a guiding tool for their units and that they make deliberate decisions based on the core theme. The core theme provides perspective/vision for the internal UUA community; something that reportedly did not exist or have the attention of everyone on campus prior to the development of the theme.

There is ample evidence that units have linked their plans to the core theme objectives. The College of Education has mapped all of their standards (both state and national) to each of the core themes and has displayed these on a chart. The College of Business and Public Policy and the College of Health and Social Welfare also report similar activities.

There is some concern on the part of the evaluation team that while units believe they contribute to the core theme, they were not always able to provide evidence that they contribute to a specific outcome. Having said that, units do feel they meet the general objective articulated for the theme. And, there is consensus that the core theme has brought units into alignment with strategic planning. There was also wide spread consensus and evidence that the core theme helped break down silos and improved collaboration.

There are numerous examples where planning for the core theme programs and services guide the selection of contributing components to achieve the intended outcomes. Below are some of those examples of planning for each of the outcomes listed for Core Theme 4.

Outcome 1: The UAA campuses are safe. The University Police Department at the Anchorage campus employs full-time, professional police officers, certified by the Alaska Police Standards Council. The services they provide include maintaining security of university buildings, providing crime prevention classes to students and employees, providing safety escorts on the Anchorage campus, unlocking vehicles and rooms, and jump-starting vehicles. Their efforts are coordinated with the Campus Response Team and the emergency management coordinator. In particular, the core theme has helped campus security and emergency management units focus and prioritize their efforts. And although their decisions are often situational, they have a plan in place so they are ready for execution when an issue arises. They have developed numerous partnerships across campus—for example with residence life and other student affairs functions—that contribute to progress on this outcome. There is good communication among those involved in campus security and emergency preparedness, and they appear quick to respond. Although each of the community campuses has their own security and emergency response teams, there appears to be good coordination between the community campuses and the Anchorage campus when needed.

It is worth noting that the range of campus safety issues facing UAA is rather unique. In addition to the typical safety issues on most university campuses, UAA also has some geographically dependent issues on their various campuses (bear and moose alerts, earthquakes, volcanoes, and tsunamis to name a few).

Outcome 2: Faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds are satisfied and prosper in their professions. The campus community values the diversity of the region. In multiple meetings there was acknowledgment and awareness of the great diversity in the student population served by the campus and that the core theme has helped promote diversity efforts and raise the discussion of diversity to a campus level.

Student diversity, although not necessarily reflective of the state demographics, mirror closely the demographics of the Anchorage area. Faculty and staff diversity lag slightly behind the region. The Offices of Human Resource Services and Campus Diversity and Compliance have spearheaded a coordinated effort to help units do a better job in recruiting faculty and staff and in advertising for positions with an eye toward attracting minority candidates. Faculty acknowledge that there has not been much planning yet to incorporate the expectations of Core Theme 4 into the promotion and tenure criteria. However, based on the core theme, Human Resources has planned for a more rigorous performance evaluation process of staff by designing a new training program for supervisors and adding training for employees. The campus has plans to conduct a campus climate survey in order to gather more detailed data on the satisfaction of employees by employee type and demographic.

Faculty members were able to point to numerous examples where, as a result of Core Theme 4, they have incorporated diversity issues into their curriculum. For example a nursing faculty member cited development of a specific nursing course related to diversity. Examples also exist in Alaska's Native Studies, Gerontology, International Studies, Department of Languages, Psychology, and Women's Studies.

UAA belongs to the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), and they have integrated the NCBI philosophy and methods into planning and the UAA institutional framework. The NCBI Committee is comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrator; faculty service on the committee is considered part of a faculty member's service load. The NCBI activities support Core Theme 4 through orientation programs for new students and employees; holding campus wide forums and involvement in employee development day; presenting workshops to campus constituents; and delivering the diversity module in Guidance 150 classes.

Outcome 3: Facilities and campus services at each campus support learning, working, and living. Decisions are guided by the campus facilities master plan. Faculty members feel they have input regarding facilities via the Facilities Committee and that their voices are heard. They expressed great satisfaction with new facilities such as the Integrated Science Building and the soon-to-be built Health Sciences Building.

UAA has a consortium library that provides information services for the university community as well as residents of the state of Alaska. In addition to the main library on the Anchorage campus, each community campus has separate library facilities and supporting staff collections appropriate for students attending at each location. There is regular interaction between staff in the library and faculty to ensure that the library provides the materials necessary for each discipline. The library also has an active Library Advisory Committee engaged in planning. It is comprised of UAA members as well as members from Alaska Pacific University, the other institution participating in the consortium. Library staff acknowledge that their function and services are larger than Core Theme 4 (and #5) and sees their efforts as fitting into all of the core themes.

Outcome 4: Programs and services incorporate sustainable practices. The Sustainability Action Board (SAB) and the Office of Sustainability provide planning and leadership for campus sustainability initiatives that span social, economic and ecological sustainability. The SAB acknowledges that sustainability is larger than Core Theme 4 and sees their efforts as fitting into all of the core themes. The SAB has set some targets and is developing plans to meet those. For example the board desires to include a sustainability component in approximately 20% of courses offered at UAA. It also has plans to reduce the campus's carbon footprint.

The campus has developed an operating and capital budget process that includes a Planning and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC) with representatives from the faculty, staff, students, community campuses, and administration. The process has eliminated ad hoc budget decision-making, is transparent, is guided by strategic guidance from the Chancellor's Cabinet, and is disciplined. Many reflected that this new process is effective and advances the core themes.

Compliment. There is widespread involvement in planning of Core Theme 4.

Compliment. The University Police Department and the Campus Response Team have engaged in a comprehensive planning process to anticipate a variety of emergency situations

Compliment. The budget planning process is transparent

Concern. While some units were able to point to how they contribute to the general objective of the core theme, they were not always able to identify a specific outcome. (3.B.2, 3.B.3)

Standard 4.A—Assessment

UAA has identified a list of indicators for each of these four outcomes to be guided by assessment. The cabinet level priority indicators for Core Theme 4 are:
- Rates of crime and incidents and injuries
- Faculty and staff reflect Alaska's racial and ethnic diversity
- Regular faculty and staff expressed satisfaction with their professional environment with special emphasis on underrepresented groups.
- Students are satisfied with student life programs and opportunities.
- Annual investments in maintenance and repair facilities
- Development and management of a sustainable budget

There is clear evidence that the campus engages in assessment on Core Theme 4 following the university's management cycle that includes monitoring performance and refining recommendations. Numerous examples exist in the self-study and were also cited in meetings around the "plan, adopt, implement, perform, and refine" model used at UAA.

The university employs a wide range of assessment tools for monitoring achievements of Core Theme 4. Some examples include:
- The Library Advisory Committee and the library use not only the traditional measures of usage data, peer group comparisons, and building audits, but in 2008 they also conducted a LibQual survey.
- The NCBI conducts an evaluation after every workshop .
- The Sustainability Action Board issues the Campus Green Report Card and uses the AASHE (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) tool.
- Many of the units within the administrative service division are using the balanced score card to assess their programs and services. They also conduct customer satisfaction surveys and are examining processes for greater efficiency.
- Space allocations are reviewed annually.
- Facilities scheduling data are collected and compiled every semester.
- Campus safety statistics are collected.
- Faculty, staff, and student diversity is measured and tracked.
- Information Technology Services evaluates their services.
- Student Affairs measures student involvement and satisfaction through assessment tools such as Noel-Levitz and the Student Involvement Survey.
- Throughout the year the emergency management coordinator and the Campus Response Team engage in activities that test their protocols and procedures. Faculty, students, and staff are surveyed on a regular basis as to the services provided.

The Library, NCBI, Student Affairs, and the Sustainability Action Board in particular have made use of effective nationally recognized assessment tools while other units have used unit or institutionally developed assessment tools. There appear to be a wide range of assessment tools among the various core themes and there may be a lack of coordination or knowledge of the assessments being done by various units on the campus. One example of this is the lack of coordination in data and assessment tools used by Student Affairs and the Alumni Relations Office.

Compliment. The evaluation committee applauds the use by some units of nationally developed assessment tools.

Concern. There needs to be better focus on assessment tools that lead to measurement of specific indicators. (4.A.1)

Standard 4.B—Improvements

There are many examples of how the results of the core theme assessments have been used for improving the planning, decision-making, and allocation of resources by the institution. Some of these examples are:

- Based on survey data, University Police Department and the Campus Response Team have put in place a system to issue e-mail alerts that faculty and staff find informative and timely.
- The chancellor's budget allocation process has undergone various changes as a result of feedback received about the process from those on the committee as well as participants. Some of these changes include distribution of the Chancellor's Cabinet strategic guidance to units for developing their budget requests; reporting on how funds allocated in a previous year were used; and getting the information out to the campus on decisions that were made.
- The Library Advisory Board and the library have responded positively to information received through the LibQual survey conducted in 2008. They followed up from the survey with focus groups and have just recently issued a report that identifies the actions and improvements made on all services that were identified as "inadequate." They plan on conducting another LibQual survey in fall of 2011.
- The NCBI post-workshop evaluations have been used to expand and make improvements in its programs. They are in the process of developing a campus climate survey to be able to gather comprehensive data on the entire campus.
- Based on reviewing its recruitment processes, Human Resources has made changes in the search process to elicit authentic behaviors. They have piloted this approach with some search committees and have plans to collect data to see if these new strategies are effective.
- The Sustainability Action Board has used the results of the AASHE (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) tool to recommend campus actions. For example, they looked at green cleaning by inventorying their cleaning products, examining them in terms of green certification and costs, and, based on that examination, made recommendations on which products to use.
- The Sustainability Action Board analyzes descriptions for each course in the catalog and has designated all those courses offered at UAA that have a major sustainability focus/component.
- IT has prioritized projects based on data and campus needs. It is also worth noting that the stakes on information management have been elevated as a result of the need to report on the core themes (how to mine data, keep track of information, create reports, and monitor change over time. Etc) and as a result IT has focused on these infrastructure needs.

There are also multiple examples where the assessment has not been completed nor used to effect improvement. While this report is not designed to list all of these, the few examples below illustrate where there is still work to be done.

- The Sustainability Action Board has not conducted a formal assessment related to the Climate Change Intensive Summer Workshop held over a year ago in order to determine how many faculty members actually did incorporate sustainability in their classes.

- The institution has had some difficulty in assessing non-quantitative indicators or collecting harder-to-collect data. Examples given ranged from time spent advising to knowing individual students and providing them with a sense of place.
- The improvements made by Human Resources in the area of employee evaluations have been slow. At present only 27% of non-faculty employees received a formal annual evaluation. Even though this is up from 9% a year ago, there is still work to be done. [1]

Compliment. The library has effectively used the results from the LibQual survey to make improvements

Concern. Many units have yet to link their assessment to improvements or to specific indicators. (4.B.1)

---

[1] Faculty evaluation processes are completed according to institutional procedures and bargaining unit agreements. The percentage would be considerably higher if faculty evaluations were considered.

Core Theme 5: Public Square

Description of Core Theme

The Public Square theme reflects the ongoing interaction between the programs and people of the University of Alaska Anchorage and the state, communities and peoples it serves. Its focus is on enhancing the quality of life and learning through engagement with these target audiences. Specifically, the objective is that "UAA enhances quality of life and learning through engagement with the communities we serve."

Two outcomes are specified for the theme:

- UAA has ongoing, regular, and effective collaboration activities with community organizations, intended to produce and promote programs and projects of mutual benefit to the public and the university.
- Community members access facilities, library resources, and programs and services.

UAA has identified four indicators to track progress on these outcomes.

Standard 3.B—Core Theme Planning

Feedback from administrators and faculty at various levels and representing both the Anchorage campus and those from other campus locations indicate that the Public Square theme is an integral part of the university at all levels. The institution's close connections to the communities it serves has been a significant part of its culture since its beginning, and the connection was enhanced further when it was reconfigured in the 1980s to include community campuses in Matanuska-Susitna, Kenai Peninsula, Prince William Sound, and Kodiak. As a result, the identification of the Public Square as one of five core themes of the university seems to be a natural consequence of its history. During campus interviews, one administrator indicated that identifying the Public Square as one of the university's core themes has simply formalized what has always been an essential part of the institution. Others noted that formal designation has made the connection between campuses and communities more powerful than ever. Planning for this theme has included input from all sectors and locations of the institution as well as from members of the various communities it serves.

The Public Square theme is a central consideration in planning institutional events. UAA personnel at all sites are aware that their relative isolation makes the cultural and intellectual resources of the university particularly valuable to the citizens of their communities. As a result, they make special effort to consider community needs and interests as events are scheduled and to broaden access to those outside the academy.

Defining and collecting data to evaluate the accomplishment of the objectives of the Public Square theme have been accomplished in a variety of ways.

- Counting the number of attendees at events that are open to the public and the number of those events is being done.
- Collecting feedback on audience satisfaction,
- Involving community members in planning
- Tracking funding from community sources, and
- Evaluating results of selected student internships and community services projects.

Community and industry advisory groups provide feedback on both planning and outcomes. Gathering data on faculty involvement in community engagement activities relies on yearly activity reports, but there is no systemized university system for collecting this information electronically so it can be mined as needed to provide broad-based institutional reports.

Standard 4.A—Assessment

The wide-ranging nature of Public Square activities, both in terms of location and content, makes coordinated and effective assessment a challenge. As noted in Standard 3.B, there is no system at UAA for collecting faculty activity data in an electronic format so it can be manipulated digitally to create reports for review and analysis. This applies to faculty activity related to all core themes, not just Public Square. Other data collected at Public Square events are primarily collected on an *ad hoc* basis, most of it at the local or unit level.

Some institution-wide assessment data related to the theme are available. Examples include:
- The 2006 application to the Carnegie Foundation for Higher Education, nominating the institution for classification as a Community Engaged Institution, and gaining that designation in both the curriculum and partnership categories.
- Reports from the periodic UAA Public Opinion and Alumni Surveys, which gather feedback via telephone surveys about many aspects of UAA, including some related to the Public Square.
- The National Survey of Student Engagement, which provides data on various aspects of student engagement in community projects, although the survey is designed for a more traditional student body than that at UAA.

For the most part, however, addressing assessment from the broader perspective of the Public Square theme is still largely in a developmental stage. An example is that the concept of identifying and measuring benefits that accrue to the university as a result of engagement activities is neither addressed within a theme objective nor as an institutional indicator, even though such benefits are clearly the result of successful university engagement. Procedures for integrating, analyzing, and reporting all of the various sources of data in relation to the theme are not yet in evidence.

In addition, goals or targets for the various indicators in the Public Square theme have not been determined and are still under discussion by members of the Public Square assessment team. At this initial stage, the focus has been on determining what the Public Square is and what it is not, e.g., what activities should constitute that theme. The institution has developed inventories of community partnerships and of volunteer activities; however, those responsible for assessment at the university recognize that counting an activity is not the same as determining its value. Indications are that future targets for the Public Square will likely pertain more to quality and impact than to the quantity of activities, and discussions to that end already are underway. One example is the plan to request a yearly list from each university leader of the five most significant partnerships in their unit as well as the expected and perceived impact in order to better target those "significant partnerships" as referenced in one of the institutional indicators for the Public Square theme.

Standard 4.B—Improvement

The UAA Cabinet has recognized the need for a timely process of reporting accreditation related results, as evidenced by an item from the "Cabinet Strategic Guidance" document of February 16, 2010. It states, in part:

Analysis for accreditation reporting must now become a regular annual operating function and it must be more closely tied to planning, budgeting, and other external reporting. The task of developing and using meaningful, assessable, and verifiable performance indicators is an on-going commitment. Our overall objective is to build a unified, comprehensive, appropriately resourced, evidence-based regime for making decisions.

Because of the difficulty of defining the parameters that encompass the Public Square, much of the data needed to provide the evidence needed for developing "meaningful, assessable, and verifiable performance indicators" are yet to be defined for that theme. Those responsible for measuring and implementing the elements of the Public Square are aware of this lack and are actively working to address it.

Nevertheless, some data have been collected and results are being used for decision making in a number of cases. Examples include

- A Student Involvement Satisfaction Survey used to provide feedback on the events, programs, and opportunities available to students outside their classroom experience. Results are used to change and improve those activities as indicated.
- The Center for Community Engagement and Learning conducts a faculty inventory of courses with student engagement components. Results have been inconsistent and incomplete, so CCEL leaders are exploring new ways to gather this information.
- Advisory committees for multiple programs across all campuses provide input that influences curriculum changes, provides research opportunities for faculty and practical experience for students, and expands partnership opportunities for the institution.
- The Public Opinion and Alumni Survey provides periodic feedback on how the institution is viewed by its alumni and by community members, with results often used to publicize the positive perspectives held by these audiences.

    Concern. The evaluation committee notes that targets and measurements for some institutional indicators within the Public Square theme have not been identified and that the objectives and indicators as stated do not fully address the essential elements of the theme (Standard 4.B.1)

Standard Five: Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability

Standard 5.A—Mission Fulfillment

The University of Alaska Anchorage's (UAA) chancellor and members of her cabinet engage in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of the institution's accomplishments. Assessment is a fundamental precept of the management system at UAA and underpins the resource allocation process. The institution appears to be particularly attentive to the impact of its rapid enrollment growth on its ability to maintain quality and, to date, notes that economies of scale have made some of these increases easier to accommodate than others. Pervasive in the conversations during the evaluation committee's visit was an assertion that, in the end, service to students and the state were primary to the institution's mission and thus the primary focus of assessment and evaluation. The evaluation committee was particularly impressed with the scope of programs that are available to citizens of Southcentral Alaska, efforts to make education accessible to all, and the value the institution places on its relation to the communities surrounding its campuses.

The university uses assessment results to determine quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment. They review measures related to their institutional indicators and not only make programmatic changes when needed to ensure that important outcomes are achieved but also review the validity of the measures to ensure they are measuring indicators that best tell the story of each outcome. The conversations about quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment are inclusive and take place in a variety of venues including but not limited to meetings of the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Full Council of Deans and Directors, the academic boards, external advisory groups, Faculty Senate, and core theme assessment teams. There is a strong sense at the institution that everyone is committed to forward progress, that all involved with the institution are aware of and committed to the core themes and related outcomes, that those closest to each outcome are given a voice in discussion, and that all voices are heard. During interviews, evaluation committee members frequently heard that UAA is in the best shape it has ever been, that there is a great deal of forward momentum, that members of the UAA community understand and embrace the mission, and that all are focused on doing what is needed to ensure that outcomes are achieved. It is a truly vital, engaged, and engaging campus.

As evidence of its commitment to the part of its mission that calls it to serve the higher education needs of the state, its campuses, and its diverse people, UAA has expanded its research agenda with particular focus on research in the public interest, a primary component of Core Theme 2: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. The institution appears to have broken through historical resistance at the system level to its involvement in research and has moved quickly to engage students in the research process. Undergraduate research has been a beneficiary of this shift in emphasis, and students report they have multiple opportunities to serve as research partners with faculty and that they are engaged in research that is of interest to the citizens of the state.

Equally important to mission fulfillment is the interrelationships that UAA has achieved among its core themes. With respect to research, the overlap is particularly apparent in practice between the interests of Core Theme 2 and Core Theme 5: Public Square. While the chancellor noted that some of their work doesn't fit neatly into NCHEMS categories of research, she reiterated that UAA takes to heart its role as a public institution that is intent on serving the public. Thus, one of the indicators for the first outcome in the research core theme is "impact of *community-engaged* research projects." The institution's comprehensive report says, "While all types of research help students develop their capabilities, the projects that directly address public issues also allow the students and the university to serve their communities. Projects that relate to the environment, public health, resources, economic development,

arts and music have made regular contributions to the understanding, opportunities and enjoyment of Alaska life. In addition to advancing knowledge, these projects have significant focus on awareness, policy and practice in the public arena."

The institution broadcasts the results of assessment in multiple formats and to multiple audiences. From a richly populated website to publications to presentations by institutional leaders at public meetings, UAA gets the word out. The external advisory boards made up of community leaders also help to communicate the university's mission and its fulfillment of that mission to the diverse communities their members represent. The institution's leaders have open door policies to members of the UAA community as well as to members of the external communities where their campuses are located.

One area that could undermine mission fulfillment is the number of students underprepared for collegiate-level work who enroll in collegiate-level courses. This places a burden on the developmental course offerings and also on faculty and other students in college-level courses in which these "developmental" students enroll at the same time they are attempting to satisfy deficiencies. UAA is aware of this challenge for open-enrollment institutions and is attempting some creative solutions.

> **Compliment.** At UAA, each core theme does not stand alone. Instead, the institution's themes are integrated to ensure that as a whole they lead to fulfillment of the mission.

> **Concern.** A sizable number of students who enroll at UAA is underprepared for collegiate-level work, and this places a great burden on the developmental classes that are offered. The institution already has this issue under its magnifying glass and is encouraged to move quickly to put in place processes that ensure that all students are able to benefit from the collegiate-level courses in which they enroll.

Standard 5.B—Adaptation and Sustainability

There is evidence that the leadership takes seriously the requirement that it "achieve the goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered" (NWCCU Standard 5.B.1). This includes providing adequate support to all of its campuses, sustaining the library consortium that serves all of the campuses, building appropriate infrastructures for distance-delivered programs, and ensuring that expectations for student learning is constant across all locations and styles of instructional delivery. The evaluation committee was particularly impressed by the scope of workforce development, certificates, and degrees offered at UAA. This diversity has allowed the institution to be more nimble in responding to external opportunities and threats than many other institutions. Both the system president and the chair of the Board of Regents indicated that UAA leaders and faculty had been particularly responsive to changing workforce demands. The institution has quality control measures in place to ensure that responsiveness doesn't undermine quality, but through its advisory boards and other connections, it is able to position itself quickly to respond to emerging community needs with coursework or certificates and then, as time permits, to craft degrees for these new or recently vital educational pursuits.

The Planning and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC) is a primary way in which the institution evaluates regularly the adequacy of its resources and, although Alaska's state budget has been relatively stable in the face of the national economic downturn, the PBAC has recommended reallocation of resources internally when growth in some areas has warranted it. Through its enrollment management process, the institution balances growth with capacity, although the leadership admitted that UAA has reached its growth limit in some curricular areas. The institution benefits from an extraordinarily loyal faculty

and staff, and these employees have repurposed space, reinvented job descriptions, and rethought critical services. Though they weren't complaining, some appear to be at their limit with respect to job responsibilities.

In response to UAA's Year Three Report, which was submitted in September, 2009, the evaluation committee recommended that the university review its financial policies to ensure the adequacy and liquidity of its reserves. The current evaluation committee discussed this matter at some length with the administrative services staff and the Chancellor's Cabinet. Institutional leaders noted that, while UAA may have some fund balances or carry forward at the end of the year, these are not viewed as the institution's reserves. Rather, reserves reside at the system level and it is the system that guarantees UAA's financial sustainability. While UAA controls its own annual budget and has autonomy in that way, its reserves are held in a pool at the system level. Both the system president and the chair of the Board of Regents confirmed that the system has sufficient reserves and liquidity to sustain UAA and the other two MAUs in the case of a financial or enrollment meltdown.

As noted earlier, UAA has adopted a management cycle that includes planning, adopting, implementing, performing, and refining that applies to both short cycle and longer cycle actions of the institution. The process is continuous and is implemented at institution-wide and within its units. UAA provided evidence that leaders take action when goals and outcomes are not being achieved and that they are in touch with data for most, but not all, of the indicators they have selected. That the institution cannot provide data for all of its indicators appears to be a function of its overly ambitious planning process and the short window it experienced as a pilot school. Still, there was abundant evidence that a culture of assessment and evaluation exists at UAA and that leaders take steps to change practices when goals and outcomes are not achieved.

The strategic guidance that the Chancellor's Cabinet provides the campus community in advance of the annual planning and budgeting process is for the explicit purpose of sharing its observations about "current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations." Further, the cabinet works hand in glove with the PBAC, the Faculty Senate, and other campus groups to "assess its strategic direction, define its future direction, and review…its mission, core themes, core theme objectives, goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement" (NWCCU Standard 5.B.3). The UAA process in this regard is remarkably thoroughgoing and inclusive. The institution keeps its eye on the prize—student achievement and service to its communities—and makes midcourse adjustments as necessary to achieve it.

> **Compliment.** UAA has been adaptable to needs of the region for workforce development and has managed substantial growth with only limited increases in resources without compromising program quality.

> **Concern.** Although growth to date has not compromised quality, the evidence suggests that UAA has reached the limits of its ability to enroll more students without additional resources. The concern is that the team did not see an enrollment management plan that detailed how and under what conditions it can position itself for more growth while maintaining program quality and without creating unreasonable expectations for its faculty and staff.

Summary

The evaluation team found a vibrant and engaged campus that is fulfilling its mission. Its five themes appear to be the result of broad and inclusive conversations and are well integrated with the strategic goals that are embedded in *University of Alaska Anchorage 2017*, its most recent strategic plan. It is a campus that embraces a culture of planning, assessment, evaluation, and continuous improvement. The evidence suggests that institutional leaders have earned the respect of students, faculty, administrators, and staff for their thoughtful strategic guidance, inclusiveness, and transparency of planning and budget decisions. As well, they appear to be highly regarded by the communities UAA serves for their responsiveness to community needs and for fully embracing Core Theme 5: Public Square. It is an institution that enjoys stretching and adapting. Based on its review of UAA's Year Seven Report exhibits and informed by conversations on campus, the evaluation committee respectfully submits the following commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

1. Recognizing both the challenge to the university and the extraordinary value to the commission and the northwest region, the evaluation committee commends the institution for its willingness to serve as a pilot institution for the new NWCCU standards and process.

2. The evaluation committee commends the institution for broad, transparent, and inclusive planning, including for the NWCCU accreditation process, and for the manner in which the planning process has created forward momentum for the institution.

3. The evaluation committee commends the institution for the camaraderie, mutual respect, culture of caring, and sense of community among and within its campuses, which reflects positively on its staff, faculty, and administration.

4. The evaluation committee commends the institution's staff, faculty, administration, and external institutional advisory committee members for embracing and integrating the Public Square theme into the campus culture, thus providing research in the public interest, public access to university resources and facilities, and mutual benefit to the campuses and their communities.

Recommendations

1. The evaluation committee recommends that the institution work quickly to refine the indicators for each core theme, ensure that measures are in place for each, reach agreement on targets for desirable improvements, and collect and analyze data relative to those targets. (4.A.1; 4.B.1).

2. Some artificial boundaries may have been created by classifying specific units and functions within a single or limited number of core themes. The evaluation committee recommends that the institution look holistically at the roles and contributions that units and departments make to multiple core theme and further that the report reflect this holistic view. (3.B.2; 4.A.4)

Appendix A:
List of Interviewees[2]

The following individuals participated in one or more scheduled conversations with one or more members of the NWCCU Evaluation Committee. In addition, a meeting between students at Kenai Peninsula College included approximately 50 students at the beginning of the meeting and closer to 25 at its conclusion. We regret that the names of these very enthusiastic students were not recorded and wish to acknowledge and thank them for their participation.

Telephone Conversations

Patrick Gamble, President, University of Alaska System
Cynthia Henry, Chair, University of Alaska System Board of Regents

Campus Meeting Participants

Al Parrish – CEO, Providence, Chancellor BOA
Alan Boraas – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Alessandra Vanover – Bookstore
Alicia Belardi – PM Student
Alison Mall – SAB Faculty member
Allan Barnes – Justice Center Faculty
Amanda Webb – Advancement
Amber Briggs – KPC College Council Member
Amy Seamans – Admissions Representative
Andrew Kulmatiski – Asst. Professor of Biology
Andy Pfeiffer – KPC Title III Program IS Net Technician
Andy Veh – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Ann Spohnholz – English Grad Student
Anne Bridges – Past FS President
Annie Passarello – Academic Advisor, CAS
Annie Route – Director of Student Life & Leadership
Arliss Sturgulewski – BOA
Arthur "Skip" Cohan – Spec. Ed. Grad Student
Ashley Vanderwall – USUAA Senator
Barbara Armstrong – Editor, AK Justice Forum
Barbara Berner – Assoc. Professor, School of Nursing
Barbara Brown- Kodiak Faculty
Bart Quimby – Assoc. Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment
Bear Baker – Dean, CBPP
Berry Kirksey – PM Student
Beth Graber – Professor, Composition & Communications
Beth Rose – Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Development (University Advancement)

---

[2] The evaluation committee is grateful to the staff at UAA for collating and alphabetizing the list of names of attendees. Many of these individuals participated in multiple meetings with committee members.

Beth Sirles – Director, School of Social Work
Bette Belanger – Manager, The Learning Center
Bette Fenn – Director, Student Health & Counseling
Bettie Wallace – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Beverly Barker – Asst. Term Professor of Chemistry, CAS
Bill Hazelton – Geomatics, School of Engineering
Bill Myers – History Faculty
Bill Howell – KPC Student Services Director
Bill Spindle – Vice Chancellor
Bob Bulmer – CAS Board Chair
Bogdan Hoanca – Assoc. Professor, Computer Information Systems
Brad Munn – Deputy Chief of Police
Bradley Lucas – Student Ambassador, Treasurer, Phi Theta Kappa
Bryan MacLean – Asst. College Director
Brian D. Schilling – Chair, Pharmacy Technician Advisory
Britney Jenkin – Student Ambassador
Bruce Schultz – Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
Bryce Willems – Asst. Prof, Geology
Caleb Heinrichs – Maintenance, Kodiak
Carey D. Brown – Interim Director, AHAINA
Carl Siebe – Aviation Tech Adv. Committee
Carol G Kane – Chair, Mat-Su Advisory Council
Carole L. Lund – APU Business Dept.
Carrie Burford – KPC Financial Aid Coordinator
Cathy Coulter – Asst Prof, Elem. Ed.
Cecile Mitchell – Director of Admissions
Celeste Hodge – Sen. Betty Davis's office
Celia Anderson – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Charles E Licka – Professor, Art History, Past Art Dept. Chair
Cheryl Easley – Dean, CHSW
Cheryl Siemers – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Cheryl Wright – Exec. Asst. of Research & the Graduate School
Chris Barnett – MS Biology Student
Chris Brems – Director, CBHRS & PUD Program
Chris Stuive – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Chris Turletes – Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Facilities and Campus Services
Christine Lidren – Governance Coordinator
Cindy Douthit – Admin Asst./Chancellor Operations
Cindy Finwall – KPC Accounts Payable/Travel/Property
Claudia Lampman – Professor of Psychology and University Honors Council
Connie Dennis – Secretary, Classified Council, Student Information Advisor, Enrollment Services
Connie Fuess – Asst. Professor of Counseling
Craig Mead – Vice President, Classified Council, Credentials Evaluator, Office of the Registrar
Crickett Watt – Student Union & Commuter Student Services
Curt Wallace – KPC Accounting Supervisor
Dannielle Metcalf – Anthropology Grad Student
Daphne Brashear – Student Life & Leadership
Daria O. Carle – Science Librarian, Consortium Library

David Driscoll – Dir., ICHR
David Stevenson – Director, Creative Writing & Lit. Arts
Dawn Copell – Social Work Grad Student
Dawn Dooley – Assoc. Dean of Students
Dean Konopasek – Director Sp. Ed. Counseling, COE
Deanna Schultz – Asst. Professor, Career & Technical Education
Deb Fox – Asst. Professor of English, Mat-Su College (voice teleconference)
Deb Russ – Assoc. Professor of Counselor Education, GAB
Debbie Gritman – Kodiak Staff
Debbie Narang – 2nd Vice President, FS
Debbie Sonberg – KPC Business & Industry Faculty/ Assessment Coordinator
Debbie Tobin – Kachemak Bay Campus Faculty
Deborah Ginsburg – Academic Advisor, College of Arts & Sciences
Deborah J. Eul – Practicum Coordinator, Human Services
Deborah Mole – Assoc. Professor of Library Science
Dennis Valenzeno – Assoc. Dean, Director, Professor, WWAMI
Dewain L. Lee – Dean of Students & Asst. Vice Chancellor, Student Development
Diane Hirshberg – Assoc. Professor, ISER
Duane Hunte – Social Work Grad Student
Donn Ketner – Chair, Construction & Design Tech.
Donna Gail Shaw – Acting Assoc. Dean, COE
Drew O'Brien – KPC Business & Industry Faculty
E.J. David – Asst. Prof of Psychology/Alumni of Honors College/Engagement & Learning
Eileen Reemtsma – KPC Director's Assistant/Employee Recruitment Coordinator
Eric S. Murphy – Assoc. Professor of Psychology, Undergraduate Research Task Force
Erin Trimble – Ph.D. Student/Honors College Graduate
Evelyn Davidson – Kodiak Staff
Fran Ulmer – Chancellor
Frances Rose – CAS, BOA
Francesca Russell – A&R Supervisor, Student Services
Fritz Miller – KPC Business & Industry Faculty
Garrett Yager – MSCE Student
Gary Turner – Campus Director, KPC
Gayle Morrison – Advisor, College Prep. & Develop. Studies
Genie Babb – Chair, English
Geno Rohl – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
George Geistauts – Professor of Bus. Adm., Co-Chair University Honors College
George Monks – UAA Advisory Board Aviation
Glenna Schoening – Parking Services
Gloria Eldridge – Assoc. Professor of Psychology
Grant Baker – Assoc. Dean, Engineering
Greg Kimura – Humanities Forum, CAS & Honors College Board of Directors
Gregory Jernstrom – ESM Student
Gwen Gere – KPC Bookstore Manager/Cashier
Henry Haney – KPC Business & Industry Faculty
Herb Schroeder – Vice Provost for ANSEP
Hilary Davies – Undergraduate Academic Board Chair
Hilary Seitz – Assoc. Professor, COE

Hsueh-Ming Steve Wang – Assoc. Professor, Engineering & Science Mgt.
Irene Turletes – SAB Student Member
J. Ellen McKay – Professor, CTC
Jackie Marshall – Coordinator, Seward
Jacque Hill – KPC Faculty Secretary
James Liszka – Dean CAS
James W. Muller – Chair, Professor of Political Science
Jamet Woods – English Grad Student
Jan Harris – Vice Provost, Health Programs
Jane Haigh – SAB Faculty – KPC History Faculty
Jason Brandeis – Asst. Prof, Justice Center
Jason Eisert – CWLA MFA Grad Student
Jeff Bailey – Director, Off. Research, College of Education (COE)
Jeff Welker – Professor and Director, Env. & Nat. Res. Int.
Jeffrey Wagner – SAB Staff Member
Jennifer Burns – Assoc. Professor of Biology
Jennifer Headrick – Academic Advisor, AZC
Jennifer Stone – Graduate Coordinator, English, CAS
Jenny Myrick-Pedersen – Kodiak Staff
Jerzy Shedlock – Managing Editor, *The Northern Light*
Jill Flanders-Crosby – Professor, Theatre & Dance
Jim Foster – Fire & Emergency Services Advisory Board, Adjunct Faculty UAA, AFD retired, AHA
Jim Phelps – HPER Advisory Member
Jim Powell – COE, Director, Teaching & Learning
Joan Harings – Budget Director and now Acting Asst. Vice Chancellor for Financial Services
Jodee Kawasaki – FS Representative, Library faculty
Joe Kashi – KPC College Council member
Joe Spear – Maintenance Supervisor, Kodiak
John Dede – Special Asst. to Sr. Vice Provost
John Faunce – Facilities Planning & Construction
John French – KPC College Council Member
John Kennish – Professor, Chemistry
John Morton – KPC College Council Member
John Mouracade – Chair, Philosophy
John Petraitis – FS President
John Riley – Chair, Sociology
John Roberson – Academic Advisor, CAS
Jonell Sauceda – Director, Learning Resource Center
John Durham – Kodiak Faculty
Joyce Colajezzi – Business Services
Judith Moore – Chair, Languages
Judith Owens-Manley – Director, Center for Community Engagement & Learning
Julia Martinez – Sr. Director, Alumni Relations & Annual Giving
Justin Fulkerson – Biology Grad Student
Kaela Parks – Director, Disability Support Services
Kam Altaffer – Social Work Grad Student
Karen Bucklund – Career Development Coordinator
Karen Hakala – KPC Grants

Karen Kelly – Social Work Grad Student
Karen King – CAS Advisory Board member – Vice-Chair
Karen P. Lee – Human Resources
Karen Schmitt – Dean, CTC
Karol Weatherby – Director of Grants & Contracts, Research & Graduate Studies
Katherine Bilton – Director Enrollment Management, CTC
Kathleen McCoy – University Relations, Electronic Media
Kathleen Murphy – Facilities Scheduling, Space Utilization
Kathleen Voge – CIS Faculty
Kathy Becker – KPC Student, Health Clinic Nurse Practitioner
Katie Wells – KPC Payroll
Kayla Rocereta – CMA (AAMA)
Keith Boggs – Director, Alaska Natural Heritage Program
Keith Masker – MSW Student
Kennaty Kerley – KPC Maintenance Service Worker
Kenrick Mock – Assoc. Professor of Computer Science
Kent Spiers – SAB Student Member
Kerri K. Morris – Assoc. Professor of English
Kevin Keating – Assoc. Professor, Consortium Library, UAB, GERC
Kim Jochum – PhD Cand., RAM Group, Biological Sciences
Kim Patterson – Director, Student Support Services, Ed. Opportunity Center
Kim Perkins – Faculty Services
Kim Peterson – Assoc. Dean, CAS
Kristin DeSmith – Asst. Vice Chancellor, Advancement
Kyle Hampton – Asst. Professor of Economics, GERC
Kyle Wark – Anthropology Grad Student
Lacy Karpilo – Director of Residence Life/Student Affairs
Lara Nimon – Pharmacy Liaison Industry
Larry M. Foster – SAB Faculty member (Math Sci)
Lauren Bruce – Director, Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence (CAFE)
Laurie Whitlock – MSW Student
Lei Yao – ESM Student
Len Smiley – Professor, Mathematics, GERC
Lesley Lepley – F&CS, Space Utilization
Lilian Naia Alessa – Professor, Biology, Group Leader, Resilience & Adaptive Mgt. Group
Lilnday Lynn Shook – M.S., Educational Leadership Student
Linda Morgan – Director, Advising & Testing
Lindsae Negri – Academic Success Coordinator, COE
Lindsey Shelley – Student Ambassador
Lora Volden – Associate Registrar
Lorraine Stewart – Kodiak Staff
Lynn Senette – Asst. Professor, Nursing
Maj-Britt Kimm – BMA Student, Adjunct
Mallory Givens – Student/Honors College
Mandy Kaempf – PM Student
Marchea Soude – MSW Student
Marci Zimmerman – KPC Director, Administrative Services
Marge Hays – KPC College Council Member

Marian Bruce – Asst. Dean, University Honors College
Marianne Johnstone-Petty – MS Nursing, FNP Track
Mariano Gonzales – Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Art
Marie Samson – Coordinator, Student Affairs, School of Nursing
Marilyn Borell – Academic Coordinator, CAS
Marilyn Kebschull – KPC College Council member
Marion Yapuncich – KPC Asst. Professor, Math
Mark Johnson – Professor of Psych; Director, Ctr. Behavioral health Research & Services
Marva Watson – Director of Diversity
Megan Carlson – Academic Project Specialist, OAA/Classified Council President
Megan Friedel – Asst Prof, Library Science
Megan Olson – Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Megan Poulson – Project Management, SOE
Melanie Hagen – KPC Human Resources
Melissa Barkley – Student Ambassador
Melissa Huenefeld – Academic Affairs
Melodee Monson – Business Manager, Human Services
Michael Reed – M.S., Clinical Psychology Student
Michael Votava – Asst. Director, Student Conduct
Michelle Scaman – Term Instructor, Discourse Studies
Michelle Whitney – Administrative Asst., ESM & PM, SOE
Michihiro Ama – Asst. Professor of Japanese, Dept. of Languages
Mike Driscoll – Provost
Mike Hawfield – Kachemak Bay Campus Faculty
Mike McCormick – Student Life & Leadership
Mike Swanson – Student Retention Advisor
Mikhail Gorshunov – BMA Student
Miles C. Brookes – USUAA President
Monica Kane – Academic Affairs
Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya – 1st Vice President, FS
Nancy Hall – Office of the Registrar
Nancy Nix – Asst. Professor/Acting Chair, Dept. of Health Sciences
Naomi Hagelund – KPC Communications Specialist
Nic Lobontiu – Engineering
Nicholas Herrick – SAB Student Member
Pam Cravez – SAB Ex-officio Chancellor's
Pam Ward – KPC Maintenance Service Worker
Patricia Fagan – Assoc. Professor of Spanish, Dept. of Languages
Patricia Sandberg – Assoc. Professor of Psychology, GAB, past GAB Chair
Patty Dombovy – KPC Faculty Secretary
Paul Landen – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Paula Martin – KPC Asst. Director for Academic Affairs
Paula Williams – Director of Sustainability
Peggy Byers – Admissions
Pete Sprague – KPC College Council Member
Philip Peterson – English Grad Student
Pinky D. Miranda – Student Services Coordinator, HUMS
Qiang Li – MSCE Student

Rachel Bennett – Clinical Psychology Grad Student
Rachel Colvard – USUAA Senator
Rachel Epstein – Bookstore
Randy Magen – Professor, School of Social Work, GAB
Randy Williamson – Director, Career Services Center
Rashmi Prasad – Co-Chair, University Honors Council (Member of Honors Council)
Raymond Anthony – Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Philosophy
Rebeca Mosquera – Project Management Grad Student
Rebecca Colino Robinson – PhD Student, Clinical-Community Psychology
Regina Boisclair – APU Liberal Studies, Co-Chair of LAC
Renee Carter-Chapman – Sr. Vice Provost, Institutional Effectiveness
Rich Kochis – Asst. Professor, Electronics
Rich Whitney – CIO/Vice Provost
Rick L. Shell – Chief of Police
Rob Lang – Dean of Engineering
Robb Donohue Boyer – COE Advisory Board, Anchorage School Dist.
Robert White – Dean of Graduate School
Robin Brooks – Academic Success Coordinator, COE
Robin Wahto – Director, Allied Health Sciences
Rocky Capozzi – Director, Aviation Tech. Div. Community & Technical College (CTC)
Rocky DeGarmo – Asst. Director, Head Advisor, Advising & Testing Center
Ron Kamahele – Director, HRS
Ron Swartz – Emergency Manager, UPD
Ronald Spatz – Dean, UHC
Ronny Parayno – USUAA Senator
Rosellen Rosich – Professor/Chair, Dept of Psychology
Russell Pressley – Asst. Dean, CHSW
Sally Spieker – Asst. Professor, Career & Technical Education
Sam Frederick – USUAA Senator
Sam Thiru – Chair, Mathematical Sciences – MATH/CS/STAT
Sandor Brown – Institutional Research
Sandra Carroll-Cobb – Chair & Assoc. Professor, Health, Physical Education & Recreation
Sandra Chichenoff – Kodiak Staff
Sandy Gravley – Director of Student Services
Sarah Pace – Office of the Registrar
Scott Downing – KPC Arts & Sciences Faculty
Scott Goldsmith – Prof Economics, Inst. Of Social & Econ. Research
Scott Tweedley – ESM Student
Sean McGrane – USUAA Senator
Seong Dae Kim – Asst. Professor, Project Management
Sharon Chamard – Assoc. Professor, Justice Center, CHSW
Sharon Gagnon – Chair, Honors College Advisory Board
Sharon Vaissiere – Health & PE Curriculum Coordinator, ASD
Shawnalee Whitney – Assoc. Professor & Co-Coordinator, Communication & Discourse Studies
Sherril Miller – KPC College Council Member
Shirlee Willis-Haslip – Interim Registrar
Songho Ha – Assoc. Professor, Dept. of History
Soren Orley – Former Asst. Vice Chancellor for Financial Services (now Assoc. Professor of Accounting)

Steve Cobb – Athletic Director
Steve Rollins – Dean of the Consortium Library
Sue Fallon – Asst. Professor, Human Services, UAB, GERC
Sunil Panthi – MS EM Student
Susan Kalina – Faculty Co-Chair, Accreditation, Professor of Russian
Susan Kaplan – Assoc. Dean, CHSW
Susan Lee – KPC Administrative Assistant, Student Services
Susan Mitchell – Head, Technical Services Library
Susan Modlin – Assoc. Professor of Nursing
Suzanne Forster – Professor of English
Suzanne K Browner – Office of the Registrar
Suzie Kendrick – KPC Advancement Office Program Manager
Talis Colberg – Director, Mat-Su Campus
Tana Myrstol – Sr. Research Admin/UAA OSP
Tara Smith – Assoc Professor of ESL
Ted Malone – Director of Student Financial Assistance
Teena Dyer – KPC Purchasing/Accounts Receivable
Theresa E. Philbrick – MS Nursing, Family Nurse Pract. Student
Theresa Lyons – Director, New Student Orientation/ETS
Thia Falcone – Kodiak Staff
Thomas Buller – Assoc. Professor, Philosophy
Tiffany Brown – Student Ambassador
Tim Doebler – Director, Culinary Arts & Hospitality, Diet & Nutrition
Tim L Nelson – CAD/GIS Open Manager FPC
Timothy Smith – Professor (Piano), Dept. Chair
Ting Yang – MSCE Student
Tom Dalrymple – Asst. Professor, Accounting, KPC
Tom Miller – Vice Provost for Accreditation & Undergraduate Programs
Tom Ravens – Professor and Chair, Civil Engineering
Tom Skore – Chair, Theatre & Dance
Traci Paige – MSW
Trish Grega – CPDS Access Co-Chair
Utpal Dutta – Assoc. Professor of Civil Engineering, UAB, GERC
Vara Allen-Jones – Assoc. Vice Chancellor, AMSS
Vince Yelmene – Vice President, APT Council (Mat-Su College)
Will Jacobs – Emeritus Professor, Academic Affairs
William Hotchings – Masters Student, Clinical Psychology
William Rannals – English Grad Student
Willy Templeton – Director, Native Student Services
Yuan-Fang Dong – Sr. Research Associate, Institutional Research
Zachary Jones – Enrollment Management