

*Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
Commission on Colleges*

**A Full-Scale
Evaluation Committee Report**

**UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST
Juneau, Sitka, Ketchikan**

October 6-9th, 2009

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the Commission on Colleges
that Represents the Views of the Evaluation Committee**

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Ms. Barbara E. Murphy, Chair
President
Johnson State College
Johnson, Vermont

Dr. Douglas M. Abbott
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs &
Research
Montana Tech of The University of
Montana
Butte, Montana

Dr. Stephen Adkison
Associate Vice President for Academic
Programming and Review
Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho

Dr. Maria J. Ciriello
School of Education Dean Emeriti
University of Portland
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Donna F. Dillingham-Evans
Vice President of Academics
Dixie State College of Utah
St. George, Utah

Dr. Gary Dukes
Vice President for Student Affairs
Western Oregon University
Monmouth, Oregon

Ms. Barbara J. Fasser
Director, Academic Resources and IR
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington

Dr. Susan Fish
Director, Oregon Professional
Development System
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Ms. Drew Harrington
University Librarian
University of Portland
Portland Oregon

Dr. Ronald Baker, Ex Officio
Executive Vice President
Northwest Commission on
Colleges and Universities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE SELF-STUDY REPORT	5
STANDARD ONE - INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND GOALS, PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS.....	6
STANDARD TWO — EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS.....	8
STANDARD THREE – STUDENTS	21
STANDARD FOUR – FACULTY.....	27
STANDARD FIVE—LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES.....	30
STANDARD SIX – GOVERNANCE and ADMINISTRATION	35
STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE	36
STANDARD EIGHT - PHYSICAL RESOURCES.....	43
STANDARD NINE – INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY	46
GENERAL COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47

INTRODUCTION

The University of Alaska Southeast is, as its institutional self-study and academic catalog report, a regional public university with an open enrollment mission. It was established in 1987 following a major restructuring of the University of Alaska (UA) system into three major academic units (MAU's). These three MAU's are University of Alaska at Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks, along with twelve branch campuses and one community college in Valdez. UAS's primary campus is in the state capital of Juneau; two other campuses are located in Sitka and Ketchikan—both sites of former community colleges. Because Juneau-Douglas Community College, located in Juneau, also became part of UAS, the current UAS represents three former community colleges and the former Southeast Senior College. 11% of all the students in the UA system are enrolled at UAS with 73% of those students enrolled at the Juneau campus.

At this time in history, the legacy colleges seem to have successfully merged into one established unit within the UA system. While occasional historical considerations sometimes arise—following different processes of two different labor contracts for faculty promotion, for example, can be cumbersome—UAS clearly states its mission and grounds it in the economic, social, and cultural part of the state which it truly values and belongs to.

This is an ambitious university. Degree programs span the range from associate degrees through BA and BS programs through several Master's degree programs. In addition, UAS has a significant number of non-credit, continuing education learners pursuing single courses or certificates. The University is committed to both technical, pre-professional programs as well as humanities and arts and sciences programs which can prepare students for further graduate study.

The evaluation committee affirmed the assertion of the self-study that the three campuses transcend a difficult geography to advance the mission. Technology is taken as a routine part of doing regular 'business' from staff communication to teaching and learning. Such reliance requires a strong commitment to acquisition, upkeep, and staffing and UAS seems to have made this commitment.

UAS has made enrollment management a priority within the last few years. Efforts seem to be working as the university has seen an increase in first-time freshmen in both Fall 2008 and Fall 2009. The thrust of the outreach is to both area high schools and graduate students through distance learning. UAS is completing (2010) a strategic plan and preparing to mount its next comprehensive plan, that one to be aligned with the new accreditation cycle.

The University has addressed all the recommendations named in the 1999 review. Several of the areas identified required a long-term, ongoing commitments (educational assessment and commitment to faculty scholarship and research, for example) and the committee saw that UAS is committed and poised to continue to address these topics.

UAS has clearly met the Eligibility Requirements as put forth by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. As the following chapters addressing each of the nine standards and relevant policies will detail and describe, UAS has the resources to address its educational and other commitments, the dedicated administration and faculty, academic programs appropriate to its mission, and financial systems and operational status.

REPORT ON THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

University of Alaska Southeast approached the task of writing its self-study with serious intent and appreciation of the importance of the undertaking. 2004 marked the beginning of the process for the staff and faculty as they used the 2004 interim evaluation report as their spring board. While the University—like most universities—is still engaged in the hard work of setting program evaluation measures and using them for continuous improvement, they have been engaged in program reviews for the last five years. The UAS Assessment Cycle was launched in 2005 and has guided this process. The report describes the strengths and challenges of assessment and was generally helpful to these committee members reviewing programs.

The self-study was attractive, clearly organized, easy to read, and well-supported by evidence and documentation in a room next to the Committee's meeting room. It was clear that UAS wanted to be fully available to the team in person, technologically, and by written documentation. On those occasions when further documentation was requested, it was promptly provided.

At times, the self-study seemed not to tell the 'whole story' of UAS, sometimes revealing some of the unique and particular accomplishments. The committee's experience of the University grew deeper and wider as we had conversations and meetings with constituents from the full range of the University. Committee members met with students, faculty, staff members—individually and in groups. We held meetings via telephone and audio conferencing. The Chair met with a member of the Board of Regents, the UA Vice President for Academic Affairs, and five members of the Campus Advisory Council. The committee member who reported on facilities visited the downtown location.

In all, the University prepared well for this visit setting the stage for the committee to carry out its work conscientiously and thoroughly.

STANDARD ONE - INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND GOALS, PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Mission and Goals

University of Alaska Southeast has developed and published a mission statement that was adopted in 2001 by the University of Alaska, Board of Regents. The statement speaks clearly to the University's status as an open-enrollment public university serving a diverse student body. The strength of this statement resides in the core values to which it aspires. Those values show a keen awareness of environment, local economy, a commitment to an educated citizenry and the importance of regional partnerships and effective technology in support of mission and values.

It is important to UAS that the three campuses--Juneau, Sitka, and Ketchikan—collectively embrace the identity and mission of a regional university and not act as three isolated sites. The University seems to have risen to this self-challenge and expends considerable resources to behave as one integrated entity in service to its mission and students.

The mission statement is widely published and forms the basis for the UAS Strategic Plan: The Next Decade, 2000-2010. This strategic plan is available in print and electronically and is supported by regular reviews of progress. As the reviews are made, the plan is revised and goals adjusted. UAS describes in the self-study that it "...reports its progress in meeting the mission and goals through the statewide Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) process and operational reviews." Of equal importance, the Chancellor discusses regularly the progress with campus constituencies as well as with all three UAS campus councils.

Planning and Effectiveness

UAS conducts its planning and evaluation activities within the context of the University of Alaska system as one of its three Major Academic Units. It seems that UAS manages well both the system expectations and its own university mission and planning activities. While the strategic plan has only three goals, they are ambitious ones speaking to student success, faculty and staff strength and educational quality with attention to all academic areas.

Two areas of planning that will require continuing attention emerged. The Plan puts forth a goal to "Foster a campus community that supports the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body". Eight strategies flow from that goal and include recruitment, development of a campus diversity plan, and improved campus climate. While it is clear that UAS has developed a welcoming environment with success strategies broadly available, it is not yet showing full evidence that it has met its diversity goals. The second area of planning to merit further attention speaks to faculty development and research. Because of the different expectations of bi-partite and tri-partite faculty members and their respective obligations, the University has not yet settled on research and scholarship language and practices that are widely understood by and agreed to by faculty and administration.

Both these planning areas will likely continue as candidates for further attention as UAS develops its subsequent strategic plan. Additionally, on more than one occasion the lack of information regarding the campus-wide information technology strategic plan was identified as a concern, especially within those programs delivered entirely through technologically mediated teaching.

STANDARD TWO — EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS

Standard 2.A – General Requirements

The University of Alaska Southeast continues to build on its strengths as a regional, open enrollment public university, serving the postsecondary needs of Southeast Alaska and its citizens. As articulated in the UAS mission statement, the focus of the mission is serving a diverse range of students through the promotion of student achievement, faculty scholarship, lifelong learning opportunities, and quality academic programs.

In light of these expectations, UAS has developed a framework of six core competencies which provide the foundation for a substantial core of general education requirements for UAS students. Building from this core, the University offers three Bachelor's degrees (Bachelor of Liberal Arts, Bachelor of Arts, and Bachelor of Science); and two Associate's degrees (Associate of Arts and Associate of Applied Science), as well as a wide range of certificate and training programs, including several post-Bachelor's certificates. Master's degrees (Education, MA in Teaching, Business, Public Administration) require a minimum of 30 credits; Bachelor's degrees require a minimum of 120 credits, Associate's degrees a minimum of 60 credits, and Certificates a minimum of 30 credits. The Undergraduate and Graduate curriculum committees of the Faculty Senate exercise appropriate responsibility for and control of academic programming, as well as curricular development, with the Provost maintaining final approval and responsibility.

Library and information resources are well integrated into the curriculum. Though the levels of resources are currently adequate given the needs of UAS's academic and professional and technical training programs, a pattern of ongoing budget reductions raises concerns about the sustainability of appropriate program support. Academic units effectively identify the library and other information resources necessary to support their programs, and the library director assigns a library liaison to each unit to assist in the maintenance and further development of the library's resources. Given the challenges of serving three UAS locations separated by significant geographic distances, the library has effectively leveraged electronic and technology-related resources to meet the needs of students across UAS. One of the six UAS core competencies is information literacy, and the UAS librarians are effective in addressing this competency in their work as well as in supporting faculty in the development of information literacy addressed in all certificate and degree programs.

The programs of study which underlie UAS degrees are structured in terms of course offerings and course rotations based on projected enrollments in each program through the UAS Six Year Course Sequence process, which is maintained by the Provost's Office. Revised and updated annually by the program faculty, the Six Year Course Sequence is a comprehensive course schedule which guides course offerings for each of UAS's programs across each academic year and semester. While there is some concern that faculty preference drives course scheduling, rather than student need for course access, the system works reasonably well. The committee does, however, agree with the institution that a closer focus on time to graduation for degree-seeking students as well as broader and more consistent support of faculty for the annual review and revision of the course sequence would make the process even more effective and help to address concerns expressed by students regarding course access and availability, and advising.

There is also an inherent tension created for students by the competing imperatives of the Six Year Course Sequence course scheduling and the need to control the efficiencies of course scheduling through the cancellation of under-enrolled courses that may nonetheless be needed by certain students to maintain satisfactory progress through their degree programs. The committee encourages UAS to continue existing discussions aimed at addressing and balancing these tensions and to ensure that students have timely access to the courses their program curricula require.

The University of Alaska statewide strategic plan assigns each of the MAUs the community college mission including vocational and occupational instruction, the first two years of undergraduate education, preparatory and developmental instruction, and other credit and non-credit courses and programs designed to be responsive to the needs of local communities and to adult learners in particular. At UAS, the AA GENP degree is the two year general education degree offered.

A Special Program Review of the Associate of Arts (AA) Degree conducted in spring of 2009, found that the degree has not been routinely reviewed according to institutional policies, has no assessment plan, varies in support among UAS campuses, and has declined in both enrollment and retention during the past five years. Given UAS's mission as an open enrollment institution, the contribution of an AA degree to improving individual income, and the potential of the AA degree as a first stop in a pathway to a baccalaureate or advanced degree, the Evaluation Committee recommends that UAS follow the conclusions of the Program Review. These conclusions speak to the importance of including the development and implementation of a program assessment plan, attention to the role of developmental skills offerings, and allocation of advising and coordinating resources to the AA degree program.

Of particular note is the success that the UAS Ketchikan and Sitka campuses have enjoyed with respect to Federal Title III grant projects. The Title III grant programs present particularly fierce competition for funding, and UAS's success in obtaining these grant funds underscores their commitment to serving their wide range of students. The Evaluation Committee was deeply impressed with the projects focused on Alaska Native students and the development of Learning Center support.

Standard 2.B – Educational Program Planning and Assessment

The Evaluation Committee found UAS generally in compliance with all parts of Standard 2.B, but with some remaining concerns, as noted below in the text under Policy 2.2 — Educational Assessment and in the final Recommendation Number 3.

Standard 2.C – Undergraduate Program

School of Arts and Sciences

Humanities

The Humanities Department includes faculty supporting a range of academic programs and emphases in the Arts and Humanities leading to three baccalaureate degrees, the Bachelor of Liberal Arts, the Bachelor of Arts in English, and the Bachelor of Arts in Art. Students report a high degree of satisfaction with these programs, attributing major importance to effective advising and instructional mentoring by program faculty.

As across the rest of UAS, the Department manages the addition and deletion of courses according to the well-established Six Year Course Sequence, and courses are scheduled through the faculty in consultation with the Department Chair and the Dean. Program curricula changes proceed according to established UAS policies and include review at the department, school, and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee levels, with final approval resting in the Provost's Office. Humanities faculty members report general satisfaction with the current environment.

Despite the difficulties inherent in maintaining three geographically distinct campus locations, the humanities faculty-student relationships remain congenial and effective as well, and students express a great deal of satisfaction with their instructors' qualifications and instruction. A review of faculty CVs confirms the students' satisfaction with faculty qualifications, and interviews with faculty and students substantiate overall good student-faculty relationships and engaging teaching.

The Dean evaluates all faculty members in accordance with UAS policy in an appropriate time frame and according to established criteria. The humanities faculty generally find these reviews helpful, though some confusion exists with some faculty concerning UAS evaluation matrices, as well as their relationship to Board of Regents expectations. The School of Arts and Sciences policy and procedures for tenure and promotion rest on university-level peer reviews and recommendations. A University committee makes recommendations after reviewing the applications, and the Dean generally supports the Committee recommendations, as does the Provost.

With regard to program assessment, while the Humanities Department seems committed to engaging the policies and procedures developed by the Board of Regents and the Provost's Office, their efforts to do so in a sound manner are currently inconsistent and, at times, incomplete. Much of the assessment data at the disposal of the department faculty results from indirect measures of student learning as expressed through various surveys. Such data presents difficulties in accurately assessing student learning, particularly in the Humanities, and the Committee encourages the institution to assist the department in developing direct measures of student learning. In fact, the Committee encourages that the Humanities Department review the program assessment efforts in the Social Science Department for potential applicability in the Humanities program.

More feedback concerning this area of concern is noted in the report section below dealing with Policy 2.2. One concern affecting sound program assessment implementation in the Humanities Department centers on the already substantial service load expected of faculty in this area. The Committee notes that competing demands for faculty time and effort as expressed through their service workload makes it difficult for faculty to find adequate balance in their workload while still effectively accomplishing required tasks. The Committee encourages UAS and the School of Arts and Sciences to engage discussion focused on finding ways to consolidate or otherwise minimize competing pulls on faculty time for meeting their service commitments to the institution. It was the Committee's sense that service workloads fall unevenly as they fall heaviest on senior faculty.

Social Sciences

The Department of Social Sciences supports a range of academic emphases in the Social Sciences and offers one baccalaureate degree, the Bachelor of Arts in Social Science. Both students and faculty expressed great satisfaction with the program, though some students have expressed desire for a wider range of more specific degree programs in the Social Sciences. The Committee notes that graduates of the program have enjoyed success in their post-baccalaureate activities, from employment with governmental agencies and private companies, to continuing on with graduate and professional studies. Feedback from students and faculty, as well as the evidence presented through the very effective program assessment efforts in the department make it clear that a well-considered range of academic programming underlying the program curricula, coupled with effective teaching and mentoring across the department's faculty, and form a solid foundation for student success, both within the program and post-graduation.

The department manages the addition and deletion of courses according to the well-established Six Year Course Sequence, as do the institution's other four-year programs. Courses are scheduled at the department level, through the faculty in consultation with the Department Chair and the Dean. Curriculum is reviewed and revised according to established UAS policies and includes active engagement at the department, school, and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee levels, with final approval resting in the Provost's Office. Overall, the Social Sciences faculty seems highly functional and particularly collegial, two characteristics that no doubt contribute greatly to their collective effectiveness as teachers, student mentors, and scholars.

As with the Humanities faculty, the Social Sciences faculty work well together across the three campuses and collaborate effectively on the range of departmental and program tasks they are expected to accomplish, from scheduling to program assessment and review and department and institutional governance. Faculty-student relationships mirror those found across UAS, and students express a great deal of satisfaction with their educational experiences in the Social Science program. A review of faculty credentials confirms that faculty are well-qualified to support their relevant areas of emphases within the Social Sciences. Feedback from faculty and students confirms sound student-faculty relationships and effective teaching, resulting in sound and consistent student learning.

As is the case in the other Arts and Sciences departments, the Dean evaluates all faculty members in accordance with UAS policy in an appropriate time frame and according to established criteria. Policies and procedures for tenure and promotion are explicitly laid out. Candidates for promotion are informed by the Provost's office when they are scheduled for review. Initial appointments letters introduce the tenure and promotion system.

In terms of their program assessment efforts, the Evaluation Committee specifically commends the Social Sciences faculty for their sound and comprehensive approach to assessing student learning in their program. Based on a portfolio methodology, the approach ingeniously combines a process portfolio approach with a professional portfolio approach, which mirrors the carefully constructed program curricula in articulating program expectations for learning as well as expectations for the professional preparation that result from that learning. The portfolios provide rich qualitative and quantitative data from direct measures of student learning. Furthermore, students report that their portfolios have proven most useful as the students transition into employment and graduate studies. The Committee is impressed with both the comprehensiveness and effectiveness with which the department's assessment efforts capture the student learning throughout the curriculum and provide sound data for ongoing program improvement. This accomplishment is particularly notable, given the significant service load expected of UAS faculty, in particular, of senior faculty.

Natural Sciences

The Department of Natural Sciences serves the undergraduate program at the institution through service classes for general education requirements as well as distinct baccalaureate programs. The baccalaureate programs are comprised of general education requirements, major requirements, and electives that allow students to pursue other intellectual interests.

The department has 17 full-time, tenure-track faculty members, who are distributed among the three campuses, with the majority assigned to the Juneau campus. Departmental faculty members hold monthly meetings and discuss issues related to student learning and teaching. Interviews with program groups described a notable cohesion of program faculty. Their interactions were evidenced by mutual trust and respect. For the most part, instructors at all three sites expressed engagement and satisfaction and exhibited knowledge of the institutional mission, although research expectations was a topic of unresolved concern among the faculty, some of whom are on joint appointments with the University of Alaska at Fairbanks.

Faculty members spoke less positively of their interactions with administration, on the topic of research and support their research activities. Faculty members for whom research is an expectation (these are the 'tripartite' faculty members) within the department exhibited frustration when discussing the role of discipline-specific research and the perceived lack of support resources to travel and administer grants. They were concerned about what appears to them to be a redefining of the research component of their appointments toward pedagogical research and away from field-based research.

The mathematics faculty (bipartite) are actively engaged in advancing their knowledge and expertise to assist student success. They are appreciated across campus for their extended efforts to help counsel, tutor, and engage students across the spectrum of program offerings. Their

student-centered focus is reflected in the program's baccalaureate degree, which results in individual degree plans for students, as well as, in the program assessment and articulated student learning outcomes for each course. The mathematics faculty are dedicated to improving student learning through a variety of means. The best example of this commitment is the use of common final exams in the general education requirement course and in prerequisite classes with subsequent group grading to discuss, review, and analyze options to improve student performance.

The institution appears to provide sufficient financial resources and support services in the form of tutoring to all campuses (especially math tutors). The learning center director indicated that money is available to hire additional tutors in biology, physics and astronomy. However, there is sometimes a less than rapid delivery of services. The delay between identification of qualified tutors, filling out paper work to actual delivery of service is seen as a significant problem as students struggle to develop a firm foundation within the crucial first few weeks of class.

At the time of the evaluation visit there were eight baccalaureate degrees within the department, including new BA and BS degrees in Geography/Environmental Resources (GEvirR). Department faculty describe the Bachelor of Arts degrees in both Geography/Environmental Resources and Biology as having been designed to appeal to a student seeking a more generalist perspective, with fewer mathematics and lab science sequence requirements. Faculty members suggested that the rationale for these degrees was to help retain more students to graduation, as well as to draw more students into the department. Another explanation for the two degrees is that secondary school teachers might choose the BA option.

Catalog descriptions of each baccalaureate degree clearly identify each degree. All degree programs in the sciences incorporate courses from the general education requirement categories, consistent with system-wide expectations. The committee noted, however, that expectations for transfer students are not fully explicit. For example, the 2009-2010 Academic Catalog states that there is a residential requirement of 30 credits at UAS with 24 of those to be upper division for transfer students to graduate with a bachelor's degree from UAS. However, only the new degree (GEvirR) communicates the degree requirement as at least 24 upper division credits in a total of 30 residential hours. The other degrees state the upper division requirement, but do not mention the additional 6 residential credits.

Similarly, Math course descriptions in the catalog restrict students from entering College Algebra with preparation completed outside of Math S105. As written, students can enter Math S107 (College Algebra) upon completing Math S105 (Intermediate Algebra) with a C or better. Faculty members acknowledge that the printed prerequisite was incomplete and that practice allows students to use the placement score to qualify for entry into advance courses.

Division of Professional Studies

School of Education

The School of Education has one undergraduate program, the BA in Elementary Education. This program was reinstated in 2001 by the Board of Regents and is offered from Juneau in a distance

delivery model. The program is provided for rural Alaskan communities and others who desire the flexibility of a distance program. While these will be discussed later in this section, it seems relevant to mention that UAS has two graduate education programs also delivered at a distance: the Master of Arts in Teaching designed for students who have completed the baccalaureate degree in a content area, and the Master of Education degree for practicing elementary and secondary teachers who wish to extend their knowledge and skills in a particular area. All programs are approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as of 2004 with the re-accreditation review scheduled in 2010. All graduate degrees offered at UAS are in response to the Board of Regents (BOR) strategic plan and respond to critical shortages in the state.

Documentation and faculty interviews attest to the qualifications and dedication of the faculty to delivering high quality programs and responding to the unique circumstances of their students across the state. The University supports these teacher education programs in two particular ways: it provides the resources for face-to-face supervision of interns, and practicum students in the rural areas all over the state and it provides specific funds to place candidates in a two-week immersion practicum in remote Alaskan villages. The UAS education programs produce more teachers than the University of Alaska Fairbanks. UAS graduates are well respected and recruited by school districts throughout the state.

The School of Education has been actively involved in assessment activities that systematically track the progress of students and the effectiveness of programs. The unit is NCATE accredited which shapes much of the assessment effort. Presently the unit is working on the documents for the next visit scheduled in 2010. In this context there is a systematic process in place for assessing students and programs. Specific indicators of student progress are tracked including course grades, test results, on-site observation reports, portfolios, etc. Decisions are made for program and course changes based on data. In the process the faculty has come to the realization that their systems for tracking assessment information has become cumbersome and inefficient. As result the faculty has adopted a commercial data gathering system which will be implemented this year.

School of Management

The School of Management at UAS houses the departments of Business /Public Administration (BPA) and Computer Information and Office Systems (CSIOS). These two departments offer degrees at the certificate, associate, bachelors, and master's levels as well as Occupational Endorsements in a small number of areas. The two masters programs, Business Administration (MBA) and Public Administration (MPA) are taught entirely via distance-based modalities. The MBA program does require a three day residential seminar at the start of each cohort based group of graduate students.

The school serves two markets: students who are enrolled in traditional face-to-face courses as well as adult learners that are primarily served through distance delivered courses.

Currently, sufficient human, physical, and financial resources are provided to the School of Management in support of its educational programs. However, faculty in the School expressed

concern that the current level of support may not be sufficient for the next generation of distance-based course delivery modalities. Faculty members who teach primarily in the distance delivery arena expressed concern that the information technology infrastructure needs to be improved and the lack of bandwidth in certain areas of the state is an issue. One faculty member characterized the situation by indicating that UAS has “hit a technological wall” in the area of distance delivery. The distance delivery modalities employed by UAS include audio-based courses, real-time courses using live video or web conferencing (*Elluminate Live*) technology and web-based courses. The lack of awareness of the campus-wide information technology strategic plan was identified as a concern of the school’s faculty.

The School of Management faculty are dedicated to their students. This notion was readily apparent to the evaluation team in numerous interviews with a diverse group of constituents. The faculty in the School are a mix of masters degree level and doctoral trained faculty. The faculty are also a mix of bi-partite faculty (those faculty members that teach four courses per semester with little or no research expectation) and tri-partite faculty (those faculty that teach three courses each semester with a three credit reduction for research). Two faculty unions exist on campus to represent the two groups of faculty; this system represents the legacy of the University from its early days of combining a community college and its mission with a primarily Baccalaureate-granting college.

A small number of adjunct faculty are utilized by the School of Management to teach in specific areas. Faculty workloads within the School of Management are an area of concern of the School’s faculty with the perceived increase in the “service” area being the area of greatest concern. Fulltime faculty are evaluated within the School. However, a number of faculty interviewed by the evaluation committee indicated a need for more timely feedback from administration regarding evaluations. All parties seem to agree that the inherited system of two distinct protocols for faculty evaluation and promotion make for a cumbersome system.

The School of Management is to be commended for its program review process and the program improvements that have resulted from this Board of Regents mandated assessment process. Programs in the School of Management are on a five year review cycle. The evaluation team reviewed numerous examples of assessment activities, some of which exhibited the completed cycle of assessment, review, and revision for program improvement. Examples include, but are not limited to: a business writing course developed to improve students’ writing skills, development of what is considered a “mid-level capstone course, pre and post tests implemented in certain courses to assess students’ progress in the course, and the suspension of two programs (AAS in Paralegal Studies and the Bachelor of Science in Information Systems). The School of Management has clearly articulated program competencies that are used in the program review process. However, the publication of these competencies was found on a limited basis in documents reviewed by the evaluation team. The evaluation team recommends that the UAS consider publicizing these competencies in documents such as the college catalog.

Standard 2.D – Graduate Program

Graduate programs at UAS are few in number, limited to the Master in Teaching degree and the Master in Education degree and the Administration degrees mentioned previously. UAS has no

office of graduate studies to oversee the graduate programs. Governance, policies, and procedures are guided according to standing practices consistent with other educational programs at the University, accountable to the program/departmental faculties, the school dean, and the Provost's office.

Master in Teaching/Master of Education/ Master in Public Administration/ Master in Business Administration

Master's degree programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. The educational objectives for graduate programs are clearly articulated and effectively communicated to students throughout the program curricula. The objectives, are the result of careful discussion and consideration by the program faculty and fit well with the overall expectations for the departmental aims.

There is some concern over faculty workloads in the programs, given the relative leanness of overall resources in some respects.

Standard 2.E – Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

While the Evaluation Committee finds that UAS is generally in compliance with the substandards under Standard 2.E, some concern exists over both feedback received from some faculty and general observations noted by committee members themselves relative to substandard 2.E.4. This substandard states that

“Faculty are adequate in number and sufficiently diversified within disciplines so as to provide effective teaching, advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, as well as to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, and development. Small graduate programs ordinarily require the participation of several full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education.”

While teaching across UAS graduate programs is highly effective, as is participation of faculty in the range of service responsibilities, there is a concern that pressures of accomplishing this range of duties given current faculty FTEs tends to spread the faculty too thin, leaving little time and institutional impetus to address the discipline-specific scholarly and/or creative activities. These activities underpin all effective graduate programs. While the current graduate faculty members show evidence of scholarly engagement and productivity, this productivity is largely the product of individual initiative, rather than the result of institutional structures designed to ensure them. The committee encourages UAS to engage substantive discussion and long-range strategic planning designed to address these needs.

Standards 2.F – H

The evaluation committee finds that the University of Alaska Southeast's policies and procedures for maintaining records and granting credit are in accordance with all NWCCU substandards under Standards 2.F, 2.G, and 2.H.

POLICY 2.1 - GENERAL EDUCATION/RELATED INSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

The six core competencies articulated by UAS are consistent with the Commission's General Education policy 2.1. The institution publishes in its general catalog a clear and complete statement of its requirements for general education. Each baccalaureate and transfer associate degree contains requirements that cover six specific categories, mandated by Regent policy for the system. A menu of local options for each category was reviewed by institutional departments and curriculum committee, and any changes are decided by departments based on Regent policy. The menu options are published in the catalog.

The institutional self-study refers to the Regents policy for the description of categories. The 2009-2010 Academic Catalog describes the rationale for general education requirements in terms of transferability between units and advisement. Most faculty members that were interviewed were unable to provide a coherent articulation for any rationale related to general education requirements beyond the Regents mandate.

Students identified concerns about availability of general education requirements (GER). Although well intentioned, offering rotations in which courses may be available once a year and at only one time section, poses potentially significant barriers for students in their progress to degrees. On a positive note, the Evaluation Committee applauds UAS for its innovative efforts to support underprepared students, including a new safety net class, Humanities 105, Critical Reading in the Humanities, now offered mid-term for students not succeeding in other classes. The Math Department allows students switch to a lower level class without penalty if need to after the first test.

The Evaluation Committee encourages the institution to review its planning and scheduling processes to ensure optimal learning and general education requirement accessibility for students. (2.A.9)

POLICY 2.2 — EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT

The procedures and requirements for UAS educational program assessment are concretely and clearly articulated through both University of Alaska Board of Regents policies, and through institutional policies articulated through the Provost's Office. Responsibility for program assessment lies with the school deans, department chairs, and program faculty, with appropriate review at all levels including the Provost, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents. In sum, the framework of policies and expectations supporting educational program assessment are thoughtfully considered and carefully constructed, and well able to support the specific institutional and system needs for effective program assessment.

However, while UAS has made impressive progress in creating the foundation for an effective culture of assessment and data-driven planning and decision-making at the institution, much progress remains yet to be made, and the Evaluation Committee finds grounds for several concerns, including those expressed in our Recommendations. One of these concerns centers on an over-reliance on indirect measures of student learning, as gathered from student course evaluations and graduating student surveys.

The Evaluation Committee agrees with UAS's own self-assessment that current Institutional Research (IR) functions fall short of providing solid support for the range of assessment activities required by the institution's assessment and review policies and processes. In addition, confusion exists over the nature of official enrollment data as reported at the institutional and system levels, versus that enrollment data available to departments through Banner self-serve reporting. To increase the effectiveness of program assessment efforts, the Committee recommends that UAS take steps quickly to address the confusion resulting from these report differences and move to allay the misunderstandings that cause so much unit-level frustration with the gathering and reporting of enrollment data.

The assessment of student learning across UAS's educational programs varies widely in type and frequency. Some Schools and programs have extensive assessment strategies based on concrete articulations of student learning outcomes. Others have only begun to develop such strategies, and some have yet to move from more traditional indicators to sound assessment practices based on student learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the Committee finds that the relationship between program level assessment procedures and related materials and documents and the University's institutional assessment policies remains in transition. The Committee found inconsistency in the integration of program level assessment efforts into the overall University strategy and plan and observes this as a missed opportunity for the University as it progresses toward its assessment goals.

UAS collects data from a variety of sources, and this collection yields much descriptive and generally accurate data relating to programs, courses, credit hours, faculty, staff, students, and budgets. The administration uses the data for reporting and planning functions. Other data focus somewhat on program assessment, while still other planned data will assess citizen and employer needs and assist in University program planning. The Committee encourages UAS to examine the need for both broader and deeper staff and faculty training with respect to Banner reporting. The Committee also notes a pressing need for more effective dialogue with the UA system-wide IR office, in terms of revising Banner reports to more ably reflect the specific needs and campus contexts at UAS.

The Evaluation Committee notes that national trends in outcomes assessment focus directly on the impact of the program on specific student learning outcomes and that doing so requires the collection of multiple indicators of performance over time. Traditional methods of using courses completed, grades received, and degrees earned no longer suffice. Nor do traditional surveys of graduate and post-graduate satisfaction. In addition, accreditation bodies and policy makers demand evidence of the use of the data to assess the curriculum and for curriculum renewal purposes, i.e. "closing the loop." Assessment plans, as a consequence, must focus on student

outcomes in focused and comprehensive ways. The Committee recognizes that important elements of an effective assessment plan exist in some areas of the campus, but more time and effort is needed to ensure consistency in these efforts across the university.

As noted above, the assessment of student learning outcomes and program review vary greatly across the four schools and their departments. Programs with specialized accreditation — such as the NCATE accreditation in the School of Education — collect and use data regarding student performance related to program goals. The best of the assessment plans in these areas assert the intent to collect, analyze, report, and use assessment data to review and renew programs. These programs collect multiple sources of data from which to make judgments about program effectiveness in terms of student learning. Some departments and programs, however, have not yet begun to examine the differences between inputs and outcomes, or between satisfaction surveys and actual outcomes assessments. Still others rely simply on individual course evaluations and syllabus reviews for assessment. Even so, from three programs with specialized accreditation and the programs with sound assessment efforts in place, UAS has a source of best practices to draw upon to further develop consistent and sound assessment practices across the range of educational programs at UAS.

POLICY 2.6 — DISTANCE DELIVERY OF COURSES, CERTIFICATE, AND DEGREE PROGRAMS

UAS is unique in offering full degree programs via distance education allowing the university to reach people all over Alaska providing them opportunities to achieve their educational aspirations. This outreach is consistent with the BOR mission and strategic plan and is justified based on the geography and isolation of many Alaskan communities. It is consistent, as well, with UAS's mission and goals. The internet allows 24/7 access to institutional resources and services to the university community anywhere in the world provided the student possess a computer. Interviews with faculty in Sitka and Ketchikan yield ample evidence that distance is not a barrier to the quality of education nor to the formation of learning communities among those who desire such internet interaction. An insightful perspective on distance education was provided by a member of the Distance Education Coordination Committee: "The issue is access. Distance education is just one method we employ to provide the student a high quality educational experience." Thus the emphasis is on service rather than simply providing technology. Ongoing attention to providing the best possible student experience has resulted in the recent development of an on-line orientation program that includes critical information about the school calendar, advising, scheduling, scholarships, financial aid, support services, distance tutoring, writing support and the library.

The Evaluation Committee notes the following concerns:

1. In some curricular areas, assessment is being conducted thoughtfully and consistently with results informing curricular organization and improvement. But, some areas still need sustained attention and a fuller approach including the consistent collection and use of data. (2.B.3)

2. Pre-requisites and degree requirements are not always entirely consistent between departmental expectations and practice and published notice. (2.C.1)

STANDARD THREE – STUDENTS

Standard 3.A Purpose and Organization

Student services and programs support the mission and goals of the University. Appropriate policies and procedures are established and published in the catalog and student handbook.

Student services and programs are staffed by qualified individuals with appropriate education and experience. The staffing represents a balance of dedicated, long-time employees who provide institutional history as a context to programming improvements with more recently hired employees who provide a fresh approach to the operation of student services and programs. The ethos of care toward the institution's students is in wide evidence across staffing lines. Staff members are evaluated annually and job descriptions are also reviewed at this time. The institution relies on numerous students to help deliver services, often in front-line positions. While this can be a positive situation, some staff voiced concerns about confidentiality issues specifically in the student health and counseling areas. Students are sometimes employed to carry out custodial functions and it was observed that the common areas in student housing, where student custodians were employed, also were in need of cleaning.

Over the past two years most of the student support services and programs have been co-located in two renovated buildings. The registrar's, admissions, financial aid, student IDs and student accounts are housed together in the upper level of the Novatney Building. Academic advising, academic exchange, career services, counseling, health clinic, TRiO student support services, PITAAS, native and rural student services center and the vice chancellor for student services and enrollment management are located in the lower level of the Mourant Building. This design has created an efficient, one-stop design for students seeking services in these areas. The renovation of Mourant and Novatney buildings and the creation of a one-stop student service area demonstrate the university's commitment to students and the importance of providing quality customer service.

Fiscal resources seem appropriate for the students services of a university of this size. Funding was available for the renovation of Mourant and Novatney buildings and new furniture was purchased for housing using general fund monies.

Standard 3.B. - General Responsibilities

The institution systematically collects data on the characteristics of the student population and identifies students with learning and special needs. Given the University's open admission policy, students who attend the university come from a wide array of age, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic backgrounds. Programs such as Student Support Services, Disability Student Services, PITAAS, Native and Rural Student Center and the Learning Centers are examples of how the institution has made some provisions for meeting the needs of students with learning and special needs. The Learning Centers use staff coordinators and student tutors who are scheduled for evenings, and weekends to serve UAS students. However, there was no evidence of tutoring or learning support for students taking only distance delivered courses.

Students and faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs and services as well as broader institutional issues. Students commented they would like to have more involvement in searches for academic and staff positions, and the development of policies and institutional decision making.

The UAS Student Handbook and the Academic Catalog outline student rights and responsibilities as well as university policies and procedures. These two documents are published in hard copy and available on-line on the university's web site. Residential students must also comply with the Residence Life Handbook which students can access electronically.

The institution contracts with a security service to patrol campus and respond to emergencies. Services are available seven days a week from 10 pm to 6 am. The housing program also contracts with the same security service for an officer to patrol the residence hall area. This service is only offered five days a week from 10 pm to 6 am. Crime statistics are published and distributed as required by the Clery Act. The Clery Act report appeared to not disaggregate some of the information correctly. The new Director of Student Services reported that the statistics will be reflected more accurately in future reports. Information regarding registered sex offenders was available on the university website. Students with whom we spoke all reported feeling safe on campus.

The catalog makes available a broad array of information including mission, admission requirements, student rights and responsibilities, academic policies, degree requirements, course descriptions, tuition and fees, refund policy, and other academic procedures and practices. The university catalog is published in hard copy, available on-line through the institution's web site and available for purchase at the bookstore.

The self-study indicated that the institution has made progress to periodically and systematically evaluate the appropriateness, adequacy and utilization of student services and programs and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for change. While some programs use assessment methods including satisfaction surveys, compiling user information, self-assessments and outcome based assessments, individuals interviewed frequently did not describe a process that was periodic or systematic, and when assessments were conducted, the information frequently was not used for evaluation and a basis for change.

UAS would be well-served to develop a periodic and systematic evaluation of the appropriateness, adequacy and utilization of student services and programs and to use the results of the evaluation as a basis for change and continuous improvement.

Standard 3.C. - Academic Credit and Records

The evaluation of student learning or achievement and the awarding of credit are outlined in the university catalog. Academic records are maintained by the Registrar's Office which shares responsibility with the faculty for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the academic records. The policies for offering credit, non-credit and accepting transfer credits for courses is clearly articulated in the academic catalog. Transfer credits are accepted for university-level courses completed at regionally accredited institutions.

Most of the University's student records, including transcripts and admission records are scanned into an electronic document repository called OnBase and stored centrally at The University of Alaska Fairbanks campus. Some paper records are maintained for a short period of time in a fireproof vault in the Registrar's Office. The institution's policy on information release is publicized in the academic catalog. The privacy and confidentiality of records and files is maintained in accordance with the Family and Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Standard 3.D - Student Services

Admissions

The university student admission policy is consistent with its mission. The policies are well-publicized and strictly adhered to. The institution has an open enrollment policy. The institution has experienced an enrollment growth over the last couple of years and would like to continue to increase that number. However, no long-term enrollment plan has been established.

Academic Expectations

Policies regarding requirements for enrollment, academic warning, academic probation, termination of enrollments, education programs and appeals are published in the academic catalog. Institutional and program graduation requirements are also printed in the catalog. Students apply for graduation one semester prior to graduation. University publications also cite the appropriate reference to the Student Right-to-Know Act.

Financial Aid

The institution evidenced an effective program of financial aid consistent with its mission and goals, the need of its students, and institutional resources. Financial aid awarding processes are reviewed annually. Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) is available on-line. The institution monitors its student loan programs and has experienced an increase in its student loan default rate. The director of financial aid is working with affected students on this issue and hoping to determine the reasons for the increased default rate and work to lower this figure.

Student Orientation

The institution provides orientation and advising for students at the beginning of fall and spring semesters. Campus tours, study skills, advising, technology and teambuilding activities are included in the program. Sessions for special populations occur for international and exchange students, PITAAS students, and graduate students. Smaller orientation programs are offered on the Sitka and Ketchikan campuses. A new online orientation program was developed for students enrolled in distance courses. This program is primarily used on the Sitka and Ketchikan campuses. Orientation for graduate students occurs within each specific program and either occurs through a special three-day event as with the MBA program, or covered in initial courses with other graduate programs.

Academic Advising

Academic advising is provided through professional staff in the Academic Advising Office and faculty advisors. In 2009, a new staff position was created to provide full-time advising assistance for this office. Students are assigned an advisor based on their course of study. An

advising manual was created in 2008 to provide consistency among professional staff and faculty advisors on the Juneau campus, and with advisors on the Sitka and Ketchikan campuses.

Career Counseling

Career counseling and placement services are provided on the Juneau campus by the Career Services Office. The Office provides individual career counseling, workshops, career fairs and other resources to help students successfully enter the professional world. The office has had difficulty in establishing identity and a client base. The office has been relocated three times in the last four years. The office seems to be in a location where it will stay for several years which should reduce some of this issue.

The Ketchikan and Sitka campuses offer career counseling support through collaboration with their local State of Alaska Employment Offices. Academic advisors in Ketchikan also use the Alaska Career Information System. Both Ketchikan and Sitka can also link to the Career Services Office in Juneau.

Student Health and Counseling

The Counseling Center and Health Clinic are located in the Student Resource Center. The Health Clinic offers students medical access most of which is free of charge. The Counseling Center offers students access to counseling free of charge for the first six visits. The Student Wellness and Peer Education program provides health education programs on campus. Peer educators provide counseling and health referrals. Ketchikan and Sitka campuses do not have health care or counseling services on site but refer students to appropriate facilities in those communities. The mental health counselor was previously a 1.0 FTE combined position with disability student services. Now, two individuals hold half-time positions for each area.

Student Housing

The University of Alaska Southeast offers students both a residence hall and apartment style living. Students in the residence hall share a bedroom with one other student in which two rooms share a common bathroom. Students can also live in a two bedroom apartment in which four students share a common living area and kitchen. Family housing is also available in which a family occupies a two-bedroom apartment. All of the facilities appear to be in excellent shape and the apartments are currently being renovated with all of the furniture and floor coverings being replaced. The department is on a four year cycle to complete this process. The department is also in the process of establishing a long-term maintenance plan for the facilities. No housing facilities are provided on the Ketchikan or Sitka campuses. There has been some discussion about establishing housing on the Sitka campus, but no specific plans have been made.

Campus Dining

There is only one dining facility on campus which is housed in Mourant building and operated by Nana Management Systems. Campus dining has struggled financially over the years. Students have had the opportunity for some input into the operation of the program. Comments were mixed among students as to the quality of the food service on-campus. The location of the dining facility is one-quarter of a mile from available housing on-campus and down an incline. This makes the travel difficult in the winter and often undesirable by students even in better weather conditions. The dining facility is also closed on weekends which frustrated some residential students since they are required to purchase a meal plan.

Co-Curricular Programs

The University's co-curricular programs complement the institution's mission. Students can form organizations that are registered through the student government. The Student Activities Board plans and organizes events that have a more University-wide appeal. The Student Activities Office coordinates many of the programming traditions such as Polar Bear Plunge, turkey bowling, Winterfest, and spring formal.

Ketchikan and Sitka both have student governments and plan their own programs.

Student Recreation

Since the last accreditation visit, The University of Alaska Southeast has partnered with the National Guard to build the Student Recreation Center. Completed in 2005, the center includes a basketball court, indoor running track, climbing and bouldering wall, multipurpose room, cardio and strength training equipment, and lounge space. Intramural sports and outdoor recreation programs are conducted out of this facility. For their partnership, the National Guard uses the gymnasium for marching drills once a month and occupies some office space in the building. While some students wish the facility were closer to either the campus services and classroom buildings or the residence halls, they appreciate the new facility. This is a handsome and welcome addition to campus.

The university also secures time with the Juneau Parks and Recreation turf fields to accommodate intramural flag football in the fall. Select teams are also provided opportunities to compete in Juneau league teams in basketball and volleyball.

Bookstore

The institution offers a bookstore which provides faculty with instructional materials, students with textbooks and the university community with school supplies, university apparel and merchandise as well as promotional items. The bookstore uses a boutique model to showcase and promote merchandise. An advisory board was just established this past summer for the bookstore. The advisory board is comprised of several faculty members, one student, and six staff. The bookstore is also located nearly one-half mile from the center of campus. The location seems to lend itself well for use and interface with the Juneau community, but is difficult for students to access easily.

Bookstore services at Ketchikan are provided through the Juneau campus. The Sitka campus provides on-line textbook sales through MBS-Direct.

Student Media

The institution funds student media through student fees. The newspaper is produced approximately two times a month. An advisor works with the student newspaper. The university has offered a class in connection with the production of the student newspaper, but participation in the class has been low. The institution has a clearly defined and published policy outlining the institution's relationship to student publications and other media.

The staff within student services and enrollment management are to be congratulated for their commitment and dedication to student success and affection for The University of Alaska Southeast.

Standard 3.E. Intercollegiate Athletics

University of Alaska Southeast has no varsity intercollegiate athletics programs.

Policy 3.1

Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

Educational programs and services offered at The University of Alaska Southeast are the primary emphasis of advertisements, publications, promotional literature, and recruitment activities. Statements and representations about the institution appear to be clear, factually accurate and current. The academic catalog is given to all new students and available electronically through the institution website, and for purchase through the University bookstore. The catalog reports on institutional mission and goals, entrance requirements and procedures, course offerings, degree and program completion requirements, faculty, institutional facilities, rules, tuition and fees, financial aid, refunding fees and charges to students, withdrawal from enrollment information and the academic catalog. Career information regarding requirements for licensure, entry into a career field and unique requirements for career paths are articulated. Student recruitment for admissions is conducted by well-qualified admissions officers and trained volunteers who accurately reflect program costs, employment opportunities, financial aid and the abilities required to complete programs. The accreditation of the institution and individual academic programs are accurately represented in institutional publications.

STANDARD FOUR – FACULTY

Standard 4.A - Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development

In support of its broad educational mission and range of professional and academic programs awarding certificates and associate degrees to bachelor and master degrees, the University of Alaska Southeast has a widely differentiated and professionally qualified faculty. According to the 2009 Annual Report to NWCCU, the University of Alaska Southeast employed 110 full-time and 103 adjuncts in 2009. The two major categories of faculty appointments— bipartite and tripartite—encompass academic tenure-track, academic non-tenure-track, and professional-technical faculty types. Each of these appointment categories provides promotional opportunities for faculty members. While the faculty types largely reflect the historical range of missions across differing institutions that have been merged as the current UAS, the institution has maintained and further developed the appointment categories to match the range of instructional needs across the range of programs at all three UAS locations, Juneau, Sitka, and Ketchikan.

UAS expects faculty involvement in academic planning, curriculum development/review, academic advising, and governance. There is ample evidence that faculty are involved in academic planning, curricular issues and have regular contact with students. The Faculty Senate recommends policy related to curriculum and other academic considerations through both an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and a Graduate Curriculum Committee. However a discussion with the senators indicated that the actual role of the Senate, though clearly defined in the constitution, is sometimes in tension with the Administration's perspective of its appropriate role. The faculty members at all three locations work well together at the department level to schedule courses, advise students, and engage in program review activities and other departmental obligations, though some faculty at the Sitka and Ketchikan locations report sometimes experiencing a general sense of exclusion from faculty governance and other central university service functions

The workload of the full time faculty is governed by union affiliation. There are two unions which encompass the fulltime faculty: the United Academics (UNAC) or The University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT). Faculty are assigned to a particular union at the time of hiring, based on whether the workload is exclusively lower division (UAFT) or across all levels (UNAC). Those in the UNAC may, in consultation with the Dean, choose between a bi-partite load which involved 80% teaching and 20% service, or a tri-partite load of 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service. Those in the UAFT are all bi-partite employees. Fringe benefits package of each union is the same.

In reviewing the curriculum vita of the faculty, it is clear that they are, in general, professionally qualified with a very strong commitment to teaching, and are generally able to maintain adequate engagement with scholarship in their disciplinary and professional areas. The faculty are also actively engaged in community and public service connected to their professional expertise.

The UAS Faculty Handbook contains the criteria and processes to be followed for faculty evaluation. Together with the union collective bargaining agreements, they stipulate the timeline for the evaluation all provisions are compatible with sub-standard 4.A.5 The exhibits contained timelines and several examples of the various stages of evaluation. Discussions with faculty indicated that the process, as spelled out in the union contract and Faculty Handbook, were appropriately followed. A significant concern did emerge, though, from the Evaluation Committee's examination, and is focused on the significant institutional need for accomplishing a range of institutional processes and administrative tasks through faculty service commitments. This large service burden makes it difficult for some faculty to effectively balance their workloads between the institutional expectations for teaching, research, and service.

There are clear policies and procedures for faculty recruitment, and hiring in the Faculty Handbook that is corroborated in the union agreements. The Chancellor is authorized to make hiring decisions that are consistent with the fixed budget. The Faculty Handbook contains the policy on Academic Freedom which is compatible with the unions' position.

Academically qualified independent instructors are employed judiciously for academically specific needs. There is a concern among some faculty in some programs that there is an over dependence on adjuncts to the detriment of program continuity. Many adjuncts have long term relationships with particular programs. The names of the 65 adjuncts who have consistently taught at UAS for at least five years are included in the Academic Catalog. The orientation of new adjuncts is left to the Dean and Program Chair. However, some concern was expressed about the adequacy of that orientation.

Standard 4.B - Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation

At UAS the responsibility for engaging in research is contingent on the type of appointment. Those on tri-partite contracts are expected to be actively involved in research activities and are provided time to do so in the workload. Exhibits provide the evaluation team as well as displays in various venues around the university showcase faculty publications. There is ample evidence of successful grant activity as well especially by Arts and Sciences faculty. As well, UAS notes in its strategic plan the goal of supporting all faculty to grow in their discipline through research, scholarship and professional engagement and devised the Scholarship of Teaching Matrix as a device to establish criteria and recognition of the diversity of scholarship for all faculty. This document along with student and peer evaluations serves as a basis for faculty assessment. Conversations with faculty indicate some reluctance, even resentment about the expectation to engage in these activities without receiving some form of compensation for the effort.

Several small but effective faculty development programs exist to support faculty in the fulfillment of their responsibilities, ranging from opportunities to teach summer research courses (albeit at adjunct salary rates) to both formal and informal weekly and monthly seminars. Additionally, the institution provides regular funding for travel to conferences at both the institutional and school levels, with supplemental funding available for those faculty

presenting at conferences. There was some frustration among the faculty that the resources allocated are not sufficient to cover increasing costs to attend conferences outside of Alaska.

Policy 4.1

UAS has established policies requiring the regular evaluation of each faculty member, both pre- and post-tenure. There are yearly expectations for summaries of professional activities around teaching, scholarship and service to be submitted by faculty. The Faculty Handbook and union contracts stipulate clearly the timelines for review. Post tenure timelines for review are consistent with NWCCU Standards. There are multiple indices utilized for evaluating faculty performance and they are clearly stipulated in university documents. However there seems to be some divergence of opinion among the faculty about the consistency in the manner in which some requirements are applied, some units have more systematic approaches than others. As often the case among academics, there exist differences of opinion about the helpfulness of the processes. Some faculty members, see the system as reinforcing and assisting their career progress while others feel the administration of the process is less supportive. More thorough discussions and communication of expectations, criteria and procedures for evaluation, will improve the faculty evaluation program and contribute to a clearer understanding among faculty.

STANDARD FIVE—LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

5.A—Purpose and Scope

Information Resources at the University of Alaska Southeast include the Egan Library and Information Technology Services (ITS). ITS provides both academic and administrative technology services to the university community.

In addition to the Juneau Campus, Library and Information Technology Services are provided to satellite UAS programs at Sitka and Ketchikan. The university contracts with the City of Ketchikan for cooperative library services, including the services of an MLS-qualified librarian. Outreach information services are provided from the Juneau Campus to both the Ketchikan and Sitka programs, via remote access to online library resources, distance library skills instruction, reference and research support, physical and electronic delivery of library materials and regularly scheduled site visits by Library Faculty.

Media Services, co-located in the Egan Library, is under the auspices of ITS, and assists the UAS community with the use of audiovisual, graphic, text and web-based information in their learning and research activities.

5.B—Information Resources and Services

Library materials are selected and acquired in accordance with the Egan Library Collection Development Policy, which is available along with other library policies and procedures at the library's website.

The library materials budget is managed as a single fund for the purchase of physical and electronic resources in all curricular areas. Each UAS program and department has an assigned Library Faculty liaison. The library collections are managed and organized using recognized cataloging and access standards. Collections are maintained with weeding (de-accessioning) of titles that are no longer useful or relevant and through new acquisitions that support the curriculum. Given the importance of distance education to the UAS campus, and the increasing availability of digital information resources, the library is building its electronic collections on an ad hoc basis. At the time of the evaluation committee visit, the library did not have a long-range collection development plan in place; so it was unclear how the library intends to balance collection growth between digital and print resources.

Library acquisition requests are solicited from university faculty and students, with additional selections made by the Library Faculty based on an understanding of the UAS curriculum, resource reviews, and subject knowledge.

The Egan Library's physical collections include 158,000 print volumes, 3,800 media items, and approximately 300 print journal subscriptions. The library's digital holdings include 48,000 e-books, and 30,000 full-text journals, including 120 direct electronic subscriptions. Cooperative

and consortial agreements provide generous access to additional digital articles and media resources.

The combination of limited physical collections, growing digital and database collections, shared access agreements, and technology enhanced interlibrary loan capability allow the Egan Library to provide sufficient, though not generous, resources to support the broad UAS curriculum and the university mission. However, the library materials budget has steadily decreased over the past 5-6 years. Over the same time period costs of library print collections have increased modestly, library electronic resources have increased significantly, and journal subscription costs (both electronic and print) have skyrocketed. The erosion of the Egan Library materials budget is not a sustainable trend and loss of funding does impact the library's ability to provide appropriate curriculum support.

In addition to on-site use of the library's physical collections, UAS students and faculty have computer access to the library's digital collections and resources from any location, through a proxy server. The library provides desktop and circulating laptop computers, and increasingly students and faculty carry their own laptops to access digital resources.

Information Literacy is one of the six core competencies of the university, and teaching members of the Library Faculty appear to be dedicated and talented instructors. The librarians carry a demanding class load, and the evaluation committee reviewed Information Literacy teaching units that are creative, grounded in interactive learning, and which demand development of critical thinking skills. Library Faculty teach Information Literacy classes across the curriculum at the request of subject teaching faculty and they team-teach with subject faculty. Additionally, a for-credit Library Science course is offered by Library Faculty. Instruction is accomplished in both face-to-face classes and through distance learning. In keeping with learning theory and best practices in library instruction, all UAS library courses are taught "at the point of need". In the case of the for-credit Library Science course, class enrollment is concentrated on students who are concurrently enrolled in classes with a research component so that research skills are relevant.

5.C—Facilities and Access

The Egan Library building was completed in 1990. As the building enters its 20th year it continues to be timelessly beautiful. The university's care and stewardship of the library facility are admirable and obvious. In more recent years a classroom wing, wireless service and a café have been added to the facility, further enlivening the Egan Library as a campus landmark and destination.

Over the two decades since the building was constructed, academic library usage patterns have changed—personal and academic computing is ubiquitous, collaborative learning is a hallmark of higher education, and users typically prefer increasingly flexible space that can be reconfigured to meet their learning and research needs. The Egan Library is an exceptionally beautiful facility of outstanding quality, with an open and flexible design. However, library furnishings and fixtures, though well-maintained, may not be meeting today's user expectations

for flexible seating that comfortably accommodate laptop computing, furnishings which can be easily moved into arrangements for collaborative or individual learning as needed, and study rooms with fixtures that support collaborative technology features. Library gate counts (visits) have decreased in recent years, and UAS librarians note that they would like to see more students using library spaces—updating of library furnishings and fixtures could promote usage.

The Egan Library appropriately leverages cooperative arrangements with other libraries and agencies to provide the UAS community with expanded access to resources, while simultaneously controlling resource costs. Cooperative relationships at local, state and regional levels include the local Capital City Libraries (CCL), the statewide Digital Pipeline, and the Alaska Library Network.

Outstanding collaboration between the Egan Library and Information Technology Services provides excellent access to most UAS information resources. Library electronic resources are available via the Internet, and physical collections are shared between libraries through electronic requesting and/or digital delivery. Instructional technology has been integrated into an increasing number of classes and disciplines, and the university has migrated to a laptop norm to facilitate portability of academic work.

The library has instituted commendable and creative innovation in access strategies for information resources, such as:

Facebook presence with content on banned books;

Flickr tour of library services;

Youtube video tutorials;

Powerpoint slides with library information displayed on campus plasma screens; and

Open house “fair” of library services for incoming students.

5.D—Personnel and Management

UAS Information Services—the Egan Library and Information Technology Services, have sufficient faculty, and professional and support staff to maintain a strong level of service at current program levels. However both ITS and the Egan Library continue to expand and enhance their services, placing growing demands on finite staffing resources.

Egan Library Faculty all hold the terminal degree of a Masters in Library/Information Science from an ALA accredited institution. The librarians hold faculty, tenure track positions and share an understanding of the guidelines and process for promotion and tenure requirements.

Professional and support staff in the library and in Information Technology Services are appropriately qualified per position requirements and duties. The evaluation committee noted staff comments regarding a lack of regular performance evaluations in the library and ITS.

Opportunities for professional development vary depending on funding availability. However library faculty noted that they receive support to participate in state, regional and sometimes

national development opportunities at a level that is sufficient for professional growth and their promotion/tenure processes.

Library and ITS faculty and professional staff serve on a variety of university committees, including the curriculum committee, the Provost's Council, the campus assessment committee, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and the Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable (TLTR)

The culture of UAS information services supports close and collaborative working relationships between Library and ITS faculty and staff. An example of the collaborative nature of information services is a computer technician position that is jointly funded and supervised by ITS and the Egan Library. Historically, the UAS Regional Director of Library Services and the Director of Information Technology both reported to the University Provost. This line of supervision strongly supported academic collaboration between the library and ITS. However the dual nature of ITS (academic computing and administrative computing), has resulted in a realignment of the reporting path so that the Director of ITS now reports to the Vice Chancellor for Administration. The realignment of the reporting path has potential to undermine the laudable and effective cooperation of the library and ITS in jointly providing information services that support the UAS mission.

5.E—Planning and Evaluation

The Library has a planning matrix, and while portions of the matrix are applicable to current library services, it is a dense document with limited applicability. Library service delivery appears to be quite strong—energetic and effective instruction units, dynamic public services initiatives, multiple outreach programs, innovations in collection and instruction access, etc., but the evaluation committee did not see clear alignment of the library's strong service components with the planning matrix.

Library management is aware of the shortcomings of the matrix and the need to re-address a strategic planning process for the library.

Assessment and evaluation of library services is accomplished with a variety of tools including standardized student surveys (Noel-Levitz), recognized collection evaluation tools (OCLC collection analysis), and use of established library statistical measures—gate counts, circulation, interlibrary loan, database usage, reference inquiries, instruction sessions, etc. Collected data is analyzed and program modifications are applied, such as increased purchases of Biology resources based on student surveys and collection analysis, and purchasing decisions based on database use statistics.

The Noel-Levitz survey provided useful and positive data of student evaluation of library services, but it did not include student comments associated with the data, which could improve interpretation of the survey results. The Noel-Levitz survey is administered only to students so, to date, evaluation of library services has not included faculty input.

Library instruction is assessed through comparison of assignments with course learning outcomes, through formal course evaluations and through on-going feedback in distance courses.

Library instruction content and delivery are routinely modified in response to evaluations to continuously improve the instruction program.

Information Technology Services (ITS) uses planning documents that show clear alignment with the UAS mission and objectives and alignment of ITS objectives with the UAS Strategic Plan.

A signature component of ITS service planning is found in UAS Online, an integrated course management environment developed over a period of years with extensive faculty input, testing and modification.

Evaluation of ITS services includes user surveys each semester to assess satisfaction with computer labs and equipment; network tracking to monitor course website activity; system monitors to alert technicians to system failures, and other strategies. Applications are modified on an on-going basis to respond to identified issues.

Commendations:

- The core competency of Information Literacy is well-served through dedicated, creative and accomplished teaching by members of the Library Faculty.
- The twenty-year-old Egan Library facility continues to be timelessly beautiful, showing outstanding university stewardship.
- Recent library public services outreach and access initiatives are notably innovative, making effective use of technology, popular culture and social networking.

Concerns:

- The erosion of the Egan Library materials budget is not a sustainable trend and loss of funding impacts the library's ability to provide appropriate curriculum support—this is especially concerning in the area of journals (print and electronic).
- Library gate counts (visits) have decreased in recent years, possibly reflecting dated library furnishings and fixtures that do not respond to current academic usage patterns.
- The Library planning matrix is a dense document with limited transparency and applicability to library service planning and delivery.

STANDARD SIX – GOVERNANCE and ADMINISTRATION

The governing board for the University of Alaska Southeast is the Board of Regents for the University of Alaska system. The Board is composed of members appointed by the Governor and one student trustee with full voting rights. Board members have responsibility for the three major academic units (MAUs) in the system and act as a whole in carrying out these responsibilities; their duties are well-articulated in published form.

In addition to evaluating the chief executive officers, they are members of the Campus Advisory Council at the MAU's and through that body, they are afforded regular access to ongoing information about the life of the University, its priorities and progress and upcoming events of significance (e.g., accreditation visit).

The governing system has a Statewide Academic Council made up of the chief academic officers as well as Chief Research Officer and two Faculty Alliance members from each of the three MAU's. It is this group that ensures that consideration for needs of faculty members are taken into account at the system level. It is the responsibility of the UAS faculty alliance members to transmit information to and from their constituents.

Faculty Senate serves as the vehicle for expressing the viewpoints of faculty members. A limited number of seats on the University of Alaska system Academic Affairs group are reserved for UA faculty members. At UAS, the Faculty Senate is guided by a Senate Constitution and recently exercised its constitutional right to submit to the reconciliation process the Chancellor's vetoes of three motions pertaining to shared governance. The committee—comprised of three faculty members and three senior administrators arrived at a recommendation to the Senate and Chancellor. The committee ended its report wisely by saying that “(W)e also recognize that although these words express good intentions, the actual accomplishment of reconciliation requires positive actions on behalf of both faculty and administration.” Although it took a disagreement of perspectives to move toward the reconciliation process, this set of actions seems to reinforce the effectiveness of the process.

A Staff Council serves as the governing body for staff members at the three campuses. Its officers and members are very clear and knowledgeable about their work within and on behalf of the entire UAS efforts, especially with regard to student success. Their meetings address issues both within and beyond the campus borders and they exhibit a high awareness of the constituencies in their communities. While staff members in Sitka and Ketchikan occasionally feel ‘left out’ of UAS activities, they seem to have the governance structures to be fully included.

Student Government Association was slow in starting this year; but, a very enthusiastic new president and vice president are determined to reinvigorate the organization. They have the ear and attention of administration and have plans to stimulate greater student involvement through outreach and issue identification.

STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE

FINANCIAL PLANNING

The Alaska Constitution has granted the Board of Regents (BOR) responsibility for the quality and integrity of the University of Alaska (UA) and its components. As such, the BOR develops policies, establishes missions, and approves funding for the University of UA and its Major Academic Units (MAU's).

As a component of UA, the University of Alaska, Southeast (UAS) follows Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) as fully implemented by the President of UA in FY 06. Built on the measurement of key outcomes, PBB uses statements of missions, goals, and objectives to allocate resources to achieve specific objectives. Some of the key outcomes have been mandated by the state legislature. Measurement and accountability between planning and budgeting must be demonstrated in PBB. Thus, the planning and budgeting framework is results- oriented.

The current System metrics include high demand job area degrees awarded, first time, full time undergraduate retention, student credit hours (SCH) generation, grant- funded research expenditures, university generated revenue, academic outcome assessment, and strategic enrollment management and planning. A new metric was recently added – non-credit instructional productivity.

With the System President directing additional state funding to area needs and concerns, all MAU's have been encouraged to put forth initiatives mostly in the area of instruction and student services. The use of these funds is intended to show the good investment the state is making in Higher Education and how accountable UA is. Consequently, state funding has increased based on this initiative. UAS has received several sizable initiative allocations from this process since 2000.

Up until 2008, the legislature appropriated one sum to UA. The President then reallocated funding to the campuses based on budget requests and priorities. In FY 09, the legislation adopted seven separate appropriations – one for each campus. This avenue of appropriation was followed again for the FY 10 budget. Under the multiple appropriation structure, reallocations can still be made from one campus to address key program priorities on other campuses, however.

Under the direction of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, long and short term financial planning is carried out according to the BOR and UA policies and procedures. With the UAS strategic plan as their guide, budgets are prepared at the unit level where each Dean/Director develops their unrestricted budget for approval by the Chancellor, UA, and BOR. One percent of unrestricted revenues at the UAS level must be set aside for distribution by the Chancellor for priorities. The Chancellor's Executive Cabinet determines the most strategic use of these funds. Academic programs are reviewed regularly to determine where reorganization and/or resource reallocations should occur to better align them with the strategic plan.

A review of the four UAS schools (Arts and Sciences, Education, Management and Career Education) verifies that both General Fund and Non-General Fund allocations have shown increases and decreases. While this is due to reallocation, it is, in part, also explained by factors such as changes in research funding, new programs, and position changes. Once finalized and approved at all levels, budgets are forwarded to the appropriate units. All campus budgets are published in the “Yellow Book” which may be found on the UA Budget website. The UAS budgets can also now be found on the UAS Budget Office website. This is a new addition to the Budget Office web site as previous budgets were not posted on their web site.

The UAS Budget Office maintains oversight of the budgets for all campuses under the direction of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. Unit directors have control over their line item budgets in order to manage achievement of their goals and objectives, however. Monthly expenditure reports are provided by the Budget Office and review of these budgets generally determines any needed revisions, transfers, or salary saving pull-backs. These reports are also used by upper management in order to make decisions on the optimum utilization of funds. Budget Office reports are submitted to the UA Comptroller for use in year-end projections. A five year Operating Report is also prepared by the Budget Office for submission to the President. As it contains trend analysis of expenditures and revenues, among other data, it is an extremely useful management tool. Budget Office staff also meet with the Provost Council quarterly to discuss the budget status of each school.

As strategic budgets are not static, UAS is allowed to move funds within their budgets. The Chancellor, however, must approve these revisions. This is especially true for any movement of salaries to operating or vice versa. With the current economic conditions, all salary savings are now moved under the control of the Chancellor. Any replacement of these positions must go through a program review process and be approved by the Chancellor.

A six year capital plan is prepared for ranking and review by UA prior to submission to the BOR for approval. Requests for renewal, replacement, deferred renewal, and code corrections generally hold the highest priority for funding in the annual capital request to the legislature.

As with all components of the UA System, UAS maintains its own six year capital plan based on its Master Plan and the guidelines set forth by the System. It is BOR policy that, through its operating budget, a minimum of 1.5% of adjusted facility value must be used for facilities maintenance and repair each year.

A persistent theme heard by the Evaluation Committee, was a need for a pro-active Institutional Research Office that provides accurate and consistent data. Currently, there are several areas that generate their own data due to a lack of confidence in the IR Office. While this may not be a fair assessment, IR is an integral part of the planning and assessment processes and needs to be a strong office used by all. Space issues are also a part of planning and analysis and need to be incorporated into the process.

ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

UAS, thus far, has been fairly immune to the growing trend of decreasing state appropriations across the country. Their level of appropriated funds has consistently grown over the last

decade. This includes increases in both FY 09 and FY 10, although the net effect may have been less once fixed costs were covered. Appropriated funds have remained steady, accounting for about half of the annual budgets, with tuition and fees make up an additional twenty percent. Overall unrestricted funds continue to increase; however, restricted funds have decreased due to the end of a large grant and the economy. Auxiliary funds have been uneven, but relatively stable up to now.

In addition to the 1% of unrestricted revenues noted above, UAS must also budget a 2% contingency pool. This 2%, which is secured from the Juneau campus only, can be used for emergencies, one time, or base allocations at the discretion of the Chancellor – at any of the three campuses. Any base allocations made from this pool have to be made up in the next budget cycle. An additional pool is held for small one time allocations up until the personnel freeze, salary savings were used for recruitment and retention one time projects.

Information regarding scholarships and financial aid is available to current students and applicants on both the UA and UAS websites. Federal, state and institutional aid and scholarship information is available as well as a scholarship tracking mechanism. UAS participates in the Alaska Education Grant Program, Alaska Student Loan Corporation and works closely with native agencies to provide funding. Grant and scholarship programs are available through the Foundation to assist both need based and academically talented students, although scholarships are down this year by 29%. Alumni did rally somewhat to cover some of the lost scholarships. Tuition waivers are allowed up to 5% of the previous year's tuition revenue. UAS awards 3% for merit and an additional 1% for need based and 1% for high school dual enrollment students. The Governor has recently announced his hope to implement a tuition program for Alaskan high school graduates. Under this plan students with A averages would receive a full scholarship up to \$5k over four years. B average students would receive one half and C students would receive one quarter.

As seen nationally, the number of financial aid applications has increased over the years with the number receiving grants not keeping pace. While the dollar value of awards has increased, it is not reaching the increase in the number of applications. The default rate on loans is also up. Whereas in FY 06 the national default rate was 5.2%, UAS default rate was 7.1%. In FY 08, the national rate was 6.9%. Alaska's average default rate was already 8.3% in FY 07.

Students report receiving assistance in how to handle their loan funds, but an effort to bring default rates down, each student receiving federal loan assistance is required to attend an exit interview addressing how their loan will be repaid. Those in non-compliance receive a hold on their accounts preventing further registration and/or receipt of transcript.

Beginning fund balances in auxiliaries and recharge centers for all three campuses increased from the reviewed data from FY 04 to FY 07, taking a small decline in FY 08 and another in FY 09. Overall operating losses were noted in FY 07 and 08. While not significant, these were specific to the Juneau and Ketchikan bookstores and recharge centers in FY 07 and the Juneau campus Bookstore, Housing/Food Service and Student Activity Center in FY 08. While other operating losses occurred in other years, net operations were in the positive. Inter-fund transfers were noted every year reviewed, but the numbers were not significant except for a \$92k transfer

in to Housing/Food Services in FY 08. Overall actual numbers could not be determined as student life program costs were moved from the auxiliary element of cost to general operating funds. Projections are not favorable over the next few years with expenses out weighing revenues if transfers are not included.

In FY 07, a contract for food services was negotiated by the System. This alleviated some of the financial struggle by having a private vendor take over this service at a minimal cost to the campus. In 2007, the Juneau Bookstore was relocated to a remodeled building, doubling its retail space. This increased their ability to offer a more diverse line of goods and services and enhanced campus interaction between faculty, staff and students.

Debt service is regulated by BOR policies and cannot exceed 5% of unrestricted funds. Through FY 10, UAS remains within this edict, and projects that it will remain so through FY 14. Revenue sources are identified to cover both principal and interest each year.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Chapter 40 of Title 14 of the Alaska Statutes, as amended, authorizes UA to issue revenue bonds (including refunding bonds) to pay the cost of acquiring, constructing or equipping facilities that the BOR determines necessary. The State Legislature must approve, by law, a project (other than a refunding obligation) financed by obligations with annual debt service payments in excess of one million dollars. Present debt service at UAS is for the Natural Science Lab, Housing, and the Administrative Service/Bookstore Building. Bond ratings for the System now sit at Aa3, Stable by Moody's and AA- , Stable by Standard and Poor's.

At the UA System, the Vice President for Finance and Administration has the responsibility to establish system processes to comply with BOR policies and procedures. Under the VPFA sits the Controller and Internal Auditor who are charged with assuring the BOR that all MAU's are in compliance.

Annual financial statements are prepared by the UA Controller's Office and include current fund levels for unrestricted, restricted, student loan, endowment, and plant funds for all MAU's. UA contracts with an independent audit firm to annually audit these funds. Unrelated Business Income Tax reports are prepared by the Statewide Fund Accounting Department for all campus entities. This department also handles accounting for new debt issues, debt service, plant assets and capital project funds.

Two deficiencies were identified in annual audits as prepared by KPMG that were not considered to be a material weakness. One deficiency revolved around Title IV recipients (federal aid). UAS returned Title IV funds late for 3 students who withdrew from the institution. The other involved the University's providing student support services to a partial population not earmarked in a grant. Both issues have been addressed and no further finds were noted.

The UA President has instituted an annual Formal Financial Review process. These reviews look back at the previous year and project what's in store for the upcoming year. Each Spring the UA President, Vice President for Finance, and Controller meet with the campus executive

management team to review the financial projections and to be briefed on any unanticipated financial issues. The Chancellor also meets monthly in the President's Cabinet where budget statuses are discussed.

UAS's budget and business affairs are under the direction of a single financial officer. This officer, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, provides financial leadership to the financial managers on all three campuses. The functions reporting to the VCAS include Budget, Grants, and Contracts, Personnel, IT Services, Facilities, and the Business Office. While Internal Audit is housed at the System, the Budget Office is charged with daily monitoring of spending plans and providing monthly reports for management review. Budgeting is also responsible for grant accounting functions and compliance. Concerns were raised by the Evaluation Committee that the grant office was slow to respond.

The UA System has chosen the SCT Banner system for financial planning and budgeting. A System-wide chart of accounts, policies, and procedures allow for standard fund accounting methods to be used. An accounting manual, as well as Banner finance manual, are located on the Controller's web site which can be easily referred to. Query tools have been developed via Databrowser to allow for the examination of historical trends along with various reports. UAS does not always feel that Banner provides sufficient information for encumbrances of salaries or for projecting revenues and expenditures. Staff have therefore created their own tools for determining these functions. Unfortunately, these tools require manual entries.

As noted earlier, the UA System has not felt the dramatic economic changes that other state universities have felt. They have been privy to unprecedented levels of financial support from the Legislature. Realizing that this would not always be the case, the President commissioned a review of statewide offices and functions with an eye to reducing costs. External consultants were brought in during October and November of 2007 to review the System office and speak with management at all levels throughout all campuses of the System. What the consultants heard was not incompatible with expectations in organizations where a system and campuses coexist; however, consultants raised some concerns about what could be perceived as a strong control culture. Among these were the relationship and timing issues of budget development. Some felt that the process is not collaborative but rather top-down both in direction and format. Some saw performance-based budgeting (PBB) as a punitive process that did not recognize what the campuses were doing well. Consultants recommended more upfront discussion of PBB and other budget processes. They also felt that campus leaders should have earlier involvement in the process so that their budget development could align with System priorities better. Since the completion of this report in February of 2008, some progress has been made and reported in communications and perceptions.

One such effort is the State-wide Planning Groups. Instituted for the FY 09 planning process, this group was charged with aligning programs by each MAU with the correct initiatives. It is hoped that this group of administrators and faculty will provide additional insight into those priority programs that need infusion of new funds. Their collective output is annually submitted, prioritized, and incorporated into the budget process.

Some constituents from all three locations have the opportunity to be involved in the budget and planning process. However, this was perceived to be insufficient by faculty at UAS. After three Faculty Senate motions on shared governance were vetoed by the Chancellor, the issues involved (including budget) were submitted to a reconciliation process as allowed by the Faculty Senate Constitution. One of the recommendations from this process was that appropriate avenues be identified for faculty input into the annual development of academic budgets. Another was that the academic units be involved in the allocation process. A third one suggested that the budget be published and available for review by the campus community. (It was also recommended that the campus begin the process of Strategic Planning for 2010-2017 and that a consensus needed to be had on the UAS institutional identity.)

In April, the Vice Chancellor and her budget staff met with the Faculty Senate to respond to questions from the faculty. This session was followed by information and a link to the Budget Office as well as a lengthy memorandum of explanation of the data.

Further inroads include a faculty retreat with executive leadership to discuss issues, the Provost's increased engagement in seeking faculty input, and a convocation at the beginning of the fall semester. While this is significant progress, the Evaluation Committee feels that much is left to be done to dispel the various perceptions.

Fundraising and Development

Incorporated in 1974 as a non-profit 501 (c) (3), the University of Alaska Foundation has a mission to advance the strategic plans and priorities of the University. Processes and procedures for doing so are contained within Board of Regents Policy P05.14. One such procedure is that all development offices within the University of Alaska System be coordinated by the Statewide Office of Development.

The UA Foundation manages its accounts in accordance with principles of fund accounting. Annual external audits are done in compliance with rules and directives as set forth by the Board of Regents. The Code of Ethics and Donor Bill of Rights of CASE are followed.

In 2007, a Memorandum of Understanding between the UA and its Board of Regents and the UA Foundation was created. It encompasses their relationship, authority, duties, Foundation costs, record keeping, human resource functions, and use of name, seal and logo.

Only the UA President is authorized to accept gifts of real estate. With this exception, the President may delegate the authority to solicit and accept gifts in accordance with University Regulations. Major fund-raising efforts must be approved by the BOR if the goal is \$5M or more. Goals of up to \$2M must be approved by the President. BOR policies specifically outline Naming opportunities.

At UAS, the Office of Development and Alumni Relations are responsible for following all policies and procedures as outlined by BOR Policies. Funding suggestions are solicited from the Deans and Directors, but priorities are set by the Chancellor in consultation with the Deans. An integrated model exists whereby staff members are cross-trained in order to function in both Development and Alumni Relations.

UAS continues to engage the community and alumni through strong outreach and community engagement efforts. For instance, a campaign to build a trail around Auke Bay was launched in partnership with the local government. The UAS Development Council has been created to help with fundraising activities as well. A group of volunteers, they donate on an annual basis individually as well as help solicit funds for UAS. This group adds to the solicitations made via direct mail to all alumni, faculty, staff and constituents in all three locations and beyond.

UAS Alumni and Friends is another group that encompasses all three locations and is one of the university's largest organizational donors. Approximately 30% of the membership of UAS Alumni and Friends is comprised of graduates, and the remainder are friends and supporters of UAS. The three chapters include Juneau, Ketchikan and the UAS Student Alumni Association.

UAS, UA, and the UA Foundation have not been immune to the economic downturn of the stock market over the last year. A short term fund the Foundation invested in was terminated and liquidated, "underwater endowment" losses have occurred, and unrestricted net assets have been reduced. It is anticipated that Foundation grants to the campus, accounting for half of the development budget, will disappear. This will also result in the loss of one staff member and some serious belt-tightening.

STANDARD EIGHT - PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Located in the southeast corner of the state, UAS is comprised of three campuses. Juneau, the state capital, is home to the residential campus and is located primarily along the shores of Auke Lake. The Ketchikan campus is located in the southernmost major city, which is the first port of call for cruise ships entering the state. The Sitka campus is located on Japonski Island in Sitka Sound. It is connected to the town by a bridge. An isolated region reachable by air and water from other boroughs of Alaska, a marine highway system developed in 1960's ties the communities together. Because of flight schedules, however, a trip from one UAS campus to another is essentially a full day trip.

A Master Plan, approved by the Board of Regents in 2003, lays out the short, mid, and long term projects by priority and budget and is based upon the goals as depicted in the UAS Strategic Plan. Over the past ten years, UAS has done much to address the issues raised not only in the Master Plan, but in the 1999 Accreditation Report as well. A reported one third of the space owned in 2000 has been remodeled and the facility space has been increased by 25% of gross square footage or 13% assignable square footage. More than \$51M has been spent to accomplish this. Adjusted value has risen 65%.

The Juneau campus has seen an addition of much needed classrooms and lab space. Seventeen general purposes classrooms were added as well as thirteen research labs. These labs eased the space pressures in the science building. Additional classroom labs will become available with the refurbishing of the Anderson Building. Substandard space has been remodeled for use as offices. Student activity space, personal fitness space for students, faculty and staff and PE class space has been provided through a joint project with the National Guard. Outdoor space has been improved with the addition of an outdoor pavilion for use by both the university and community. Outdoor lab and recreational space will come on line with the addition of a trail around Auke Lake, another project carried out in conjunction with the city and local groups. Student services have been upgraded by reconfiguring space to accommodate the registrar, cashier, and financial aid in one area. Acquisition and remodeling projects were carried out to move personnel from downtown to Auke Bay enabling more efficient services to students, faculty and staff. Relocating the bookstore has allowed for more retail space and opened on campus space for expanding student services. The relocation of administrative offices allowed for the renovation of space for programmatic use. All of these improvements can be linked to elements in the UAS Strategic Plan and follow the Master Plan.

On the Ketchikan campus, the two buildings that house primary instructional and support facilities have been reconfigured. Another building, previously considered substandard, has been gutted and remodeled and is now being used for programmatic purposes. The issue of signage as noted in the Master Plan is still awaiting funding. The central issue regarding these facilities was the need to upgrade existing program space to meet current and projected needs. For the most part, these two updates complete plans earmarked in the Master Plan for this campus.

The conversion of a WWII airplane hangar into career and technical instructional space on the Sitka Campus should increase the amount of space for Distance Learning and bring the building

up to code compliance. Although Sitka continues to improve on the hangar space (building within a building), there may still be a few code issues due to the lack of walls in the remaining space. Signage as brought up by the Master Plan will be addressed by the upcoming state funded highway project. Sitka has since established a new Master Planning Committee to examine plans for further development.

Overall, between 1999 and 2008, classroom space increased 42.9%, with the Juneau and Ketchikan campus on the plus side and Sitka decreasing slightly. Laboratory space increased overall 16.8%, with Juneau and Sitka increasing and Ketchikan decreasing slightly. Office space increased overall 14.8% with each campus showing improvement in the numbers. However, additional office space may be needed as one college is setting up cubicles in common areas to accommodate adjunct faculty. Library space decreased overall; this is explained by the reassignment of this function to a partnership with the public library in Sitka. There was a small increase in Library space on the Juneau campus.

Given the accomplishments of UAS over the last decade in updating and rejuvenating its space, the physical aspects of the campuses are sufficient for their current student body. The addition of new faculty, however, may necessitate additional offices. There remain some opportunities for additional refurbishing as there always are on university campuses. For instance, housing is now being refurbished at the rate of 3-4 units per semester.

Occupancy rates within Housing remain high. With a total bed count of 291, the average occupancy since FY 06 has been more than 95%. Because of these high rates, UAS has begun to work with the City and Borough of Juneau to rezone land that borders the campus. The hope is to partner with public or private housing developers to build and operate family housing near the campus. With demographics projecting a reduction in the 20-24 age group over the next three decades, this seems like a more cautious plan than building a new residence hall.

Furnishings and equipment appear adequate for the programs presently being offered as well as attractive and comfortable. Most classroom furnishings were standardized in 2003 and all will be standardized when the Anderson Building is renovated. Equipment purchases are available through capital projects, grants, and the operating budget. However, as a university that is partially geared to distance education, seeks to be the primary provider of information technology education in the region, and strives to be the first-choice source of vocational education, maintaining an up to date, state of the art equipment base will not be easy without additional funding.

The Board of Regents requires a formal review and updating of the Master Plan on a five to seven year cycle. The present plan runs through 2012.

The Board of Regents also requires a six year capital plan. These plans, pegged to the Master Plan, are based on the assumption that full funding will be received by the State. The plans are developed at the campus level and forwarded to the System where they are prioritized for BOR approval prior to being submitted to the state.

Renewal and renovation funding continues to be a high priority as backlogs of deferred maintenance continues to exist. At the present time, UAS's deferred maintenance is estimated at

about \$13M. Maintenance, repair, and renewal of UAS facilities are set at a minimum of 1.5% of the replacement cost of all facilities per year. Some additional funding has been received from the legislature, thus allowing UAS to meet or exceed this system-required standard in all but one year (2002). So, while resources allow regular but minimal attention to this problem, there is still a way to go. This trend is not inconsistent with a pattern that exists across the country.

Each campus is monitored by a building automation system and each campus maintains its own facilities management team. All construction codes are enforced and OSHA and EPA regulations are followed.

UAS self-reports an issue with their new Astra space management scheduling software. Lock-outs were occurring with one building downtown. One concern was whether this led to underutilization on classroom reports. Another real concern led to the replacement of slide key locks to prevent theft in the computer lab.

Safety issues are reviewed by a Standing Safety Committee that meets periodically. A website for Health and Safety is maintained that contains plans for such as well as an Office for Health and Safety. An Emergency Operations Plan is maintained, a copy of which is located in offices and classrooms. Baseline OSHA Safety Training is provided as is training in the proper use and storage of hazardous waste. Fire alarms are both light and tone mechanisms.

Emergency call boxes and video cameras are strategically placed around campus, especially along those pathways bordered by dense forest. A 24 hour service is available for emergency calls and a private security firm periodically patrols the campus at night. While several students report feeling very safe on campus, others still feel an issue exists because of only infrequent late night transportation between the two town buildings where some night classes are held and the residence halls. This will be addressed by providing a van for residential students to use for evening classes downtown. Training will be provided for student drivers.

Student concerns regarding lighted paths along densely wooded areas may be alleviated soon. Although the lights along the paths meet industry standards, an experimental project with placing LED lighting in the woods close to the paths should bring an additional element of security.

Several pedestrian/vehicular conflicts were noted in the Master Plan. Most notably the crossing of Glacier Highway to access the Anderson Building, crossing the Mendenhall Loop Road to access the SAC Building and student housing, and along segments of Glacier Highway where no walkways exist.

The issue of crossing Glacier Highway to access Anderson will be alleviated with the renovation of the building. An elevated walkway will bridge the highway and connect to Anderson as part of the renovation. Sidewalks along Glacier Highway, as well as a bike path, are incorporated into the 2013 highway plans.

STANDARD NINE – INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

University of Alaska Southeast meets the standard for institutional integrity through its own efforts as well as by consistently adhering to the University of Alaska Board of Regents requirements. The University represents itself accurately to its public through its website, printed materials, and oral communications. Employees of the University are subject to the Code of Ethics Alaska Statutes which “considers a public office to be a public trust”. Employees of the UA system are required to sign annually disclosure form for all their outside employment. Employees of the UA system are further required to adhere to the Professional Teaching Practices Commission.

The Student Code of Conduct is printed in the academic catalog and online. The Academic Catalog is reviewed and revised annually to reflect the most current information and policies. Statements to the public are accurate and consistent. The Campus Advisory Council is comprised of members in accordance with the Board of Regents Policy on Councils. Members describe themselves as regularly and accurately informed by the Chancellor and other on campus on important, regular, and timely issues. Examples include accreditation, enrollment, master planning.

Freedom of speech is reinforced by BOR policy P01.02.010 which ensures broad freedom “limited only by the precepts of scholarship and performance of academic duties.” When disputes arise, appropriate channels seem to exist for resolution. Grievance policies are outlined in the union collective bargaining agreements and in BOR policies. The rights of students in judicial proceedings and processes are outlined in the Academic Catalog and the Student Handbook.

As the institutional self-study reports “Commitment to institutional integrity requires constant vigilance.” UAS commits to continuing application of ethical standards balanced by a dedication to free inquiry.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

University of Alaska Southeast prepared well for its accreditation review following all of the most recent accreditation and Commission recommendations and requirements and building them into their strategic plans. UAS is serious about its work and aligns its resources with its mission and values. Staff and faculty are dedicated to the work they perform and well-prepared and trained to carry it out. The University has an extraordinary awareness of its geographic, social, and economic context and honors it.

GENERAL COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. The University of Alaska Southeast has worked carefully to craft a mission statement and guiding characteristics that are distinct, truly aware of the geographical, cultural, and economic environment, and committed to open access and student transformation.
2. The staff, faculty, and administrators we met and spoke with on all campuses are committed to student success through multiple strategies. Staff and faculty at UAS show a willingness and enthusiasm to create innovative approaches to reach out to students and to modify and adapt these strategies to stay fresh and relevant.
3. The University demonstrates a keen awareness of its external communities—local, regional, and statewide. The needs of the community and the state of Alaska figure prominently in planning at all three campuses and staff and faculty are responsive to constituents as they select and modify programs and design services.
4. The quality of facilities and care of these facilities is noteworthy. While the natural environment is the guiding aesthetic, it is clear that University personnel are mindful of the role of facilities in supporting programs and students; this keen awareness makes for welcoming and inclusive settings.

Recommendations

1. While the mission of the University of Alaska Southeast is clearly and directly presented, still, the University identity sometimes seems to be at odds with itself in its interpreting this mission. We recommend that the University revisit its mission and the full range of programs and offerings under the umbrella of this mission to affirm itself as a fully integrated university dedicated to a common purpose. (1.A.1 and 1.A.5)
2. The evaluation committee recommends that the University review its strategies and systems for communication within and across units for greater understanding and progress toward shared and explicit goals. (6.C.6)
3. While the University has undertaken an ambitious planning effort this last decade, UAS is not yet fully realizing the benefits of this planning. In some cases, evaluation activities fall short of yielding the information that will lead to program modifications for improvement. (1.B.9)

As the University begins its next cycle of strategic planning, it will be well-served by identifying those evaluation strategies that will best measure desired outcomes. With those assessment activities in place, the assessment “loop” will be completed, yielding ongoing opportunities for evaluation and improvement. The committee recommends that UAS extend this strengthened assessment for improvement to include academic, co-curricular, and student learning outcomes. (1.B.4, 3B6 and 2.B.2)

4. The evaluation committee recommends that the University review its budget processes to make certain that they best serve the goals and purposes of the University. This review will allow the University to make certain that appropriate opportunities to make budget decisions and to report and act on these decisions are delegated to those who need the information to effectively carry out their work. (7.A.3) (6.A.3)