Winters at UAF may be cold, but there are plenty of warm, bright days in September.
UAF photo by Jonathan Hughes

STANDARD ONE

Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

1.A. Mission and Goals

The University of Alaska Fairbanks, as one of three major administrative units (MAUs) in the University of Alaska system, is governed not only by its own mission and goals but also by those of the University of Alaska system. Both missions are quite broad, applicable to campuses with programs that include adult developmental education and entry-level vocational training as well as associate and baccalaureate degrees, research, doctoral instruction, and public service. The mission statements that guided UAF from 1988 to 2000 and the system from 1983 to 2000 are provided as exhibits [E1.6; E1.7].

The 1988 UAF mission statement was developed in an unsettled climate after the entire University of Alaska system had undergone extensive reorganization. The statement was an inclusive presentation of UAF's many activities, and therefore it did not provide a basis for the institution to focus its planning on long-term continuing problems or respond to new opportunities. Such focus was needed during the fiscal crisis in the state in the 1990s. State revenues from oil production decreased rapidly, with a consequent rapid reduction of about 20 percent in state funding for the University of Alaska system. While the average growth in state funding for public universities nationally was about 42 percent from 1986 to 1996, that for the University of Alaska was 2 percent (data from "Grapevine," Illinois State University). State funding for UAF declined 35 percent in real dollar value.

In 1992 the chancellor appointed a group of faculty, staff, students, and community leaders to discuss UAF's shape and direction for the remainder of the decade. Following review by the UAF community, the resulting document, "Strategic Plan: UAF 2000" [E1.8], outlined six major goals compatible with UAF's mission, along with specific strategies for meeting them. The goals were intended to provide a well-defined vision to guide institutional decision-making processes, not to target specific programs or units. The strategies were intended to provide guidelines to shape the planning and budgeting of individual units as they created specific action plans to address the goals. During the 1990s, UAF continually referred to the goals of the strategic plan and to the mission statement while reacting to diminished state funding and tuition revenue.

During the 1990s, the Board of Regents considered bringing sharper distinction to the role of each of the three MAUs and stressed the interdependence of each in carrying out the mission of the system. In 1994 the board wrote an informal mission statement for the entire UA system. This statement was subsequently published along with the formal mission statements in all board agendas:

> The University of Alaska is a comprehensive, multi-mission single university
> with three main campuses which serves Alaska and Alaskans and which delivers
> high quality instruction, research and public service efficiently and innovatively.

Although the board and the UA administration have explored ways to improve efficiency through increased cooperation among the three MAUs, they have not formally considered restructuring the system into a single accredited institution. However, the need for efficiency in educational programs and administrative services in the face of diminished state funding has

fostered more collaboration and coordination among the three MAUs than existed previously. Additionally, the three MAUs have recently been able to focus more on their individual missions, visions, and goals than was possible in the unsettled economic climate of the late 1980s and early '90s.

Evidence-Based Description

The current mission and goals, and strategies for achieving them, are set forth in "Strategic Plan: UAF 2005" [A1.4]. This document defines the institution, including its educational activities, its student body, and its role within the higher education community (1.A).

A formal reexamination of UAF's mission and goals by the university community began in February 1999 with appointment of a committee to review the mission. The committee developed four alternative drafts and distributed them widely for review in January 2000. An interactive web page fostered input from the university community and the public and kept them informed of progress. Comments received indicated preference for a single, succinct statement speaking to "why the university was here." The Board of Regents approved the following in April 2000 as the UAF mission statement (1.A.1):

> The University of Alaska Fairbanks, as the nation's northernmost Land, Sea, and Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through creative teaching, research, and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the North, and their diverse peoples.

The following October the Board of Regents adopted a similar mission statement for the entire UA system [A1.1].

The UAF and UA mission statements reflect the broad role of the University of Alaska as the only major institution of higher learning in the state. UAF thus has a wide breadth of responsibility and is required to provide a vast range of academic services. UAF's particular emphasis within the mission of the system is its Land, Sea, and Space Grant instructional, research, and service programs. It is the major research institution—public, private, or governmental—in and for the state. As the only public institution of higher learning in Alaska's Interior and as a result of the merger of community colleges and the university into one institution, UAF must meet demands extending to vocational and non-credit training and developmental preparation as well as the traditional university programs. UAF has had to establish priorities in response to each of these demands.

UAF's strategic plan elaborates upon the mission statement, providing detailed and specific emphases for planning and program development. Updating the goals and strategies began in the 2000 Chancellor's Spring Conference with an analysis of progress made in meeting the goals and of how well the goals and strategies had worked [A1.9; E1.9]. Senior staff and informal review groups were united in the opinion that the main goals put forth in 1993 in "UAF 2000" were still appropriate. Accordingly, in March the chancellor appointed formal review committees composed of faculty, administration, and students and instructed them to modify the goals only enough to maintain currency. Major effort was to be placed on the strategic objectives. The

committees' and subsequent drafts were posted on the university web site for review and comment and revised accordingly. The Faculty Senate, Staff Council, the Associated Students of UAF, advisory groups, deans, directors, faculty, staff, and students received copies of the drafts for review (1.A.1). The Chancellor's Cabinet added indicators of progress and adopted the final version on the plan at the end of July, 2001.

The goals of "Strategic Plan: UAF 2005" [A1.4] listed below remain much as in "UAF 2000." Some highlights of progress and modifications of objectives are noted:

- *Serve as a world leader in Arctic research and related graduate education.*
  To the previous objectives was added enhancement of undergraduate research. Progress was made with the addition of the International Arctic Research Center (IARC) and an increase in the number of master's degrees awarded. Strengthening the Ph.D. program is given more emphasis.
- *Provide high quality undergraduate education for traditional and non-traditional students.*
  Strategies are sharpened to reflect such things as the success of academic competition teams and the student Alaska Renaissance Project, the enrollment of Alaska Scholars recipients, renewed efforts in distance delivery, and the continuing need for developmental education.
- *Form active collaborations with communities, organizations, businesses and government to meet identified state, national and global needs.*
  Following the development of the Process Technology program and K-12 collaborations with new outreach programs and use of facilities, the objectives have become more specific and the strategies more generalized to encourage a wider response.
- *Serve as the premiere higher educational center for Alaska Natives.*
  Objectives were reduced to reflect those specific to Alaska Natives; strategies are likewise focused. Progress includes the national recognition of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, renovation of a building to serve as a central area for programs pertaining to Alaska Natives, and implementation of the Rural Development master's program and the certificate/associate in Tribal Management. Despite an overall reduction in the student body, the number of Native students has increased modestly over the decade.
- *Serve as a model to demonstrate how gender, racial, and cultural diversity can strengthen a university and society.*
  A Women's Center and a Multicultural Center on the Fairbanks campus bring prominence to this goal. The student body gained in Black and Asian representation but declined in other non-Native minorities. The faculty remain less diverse than the student body.
- *Serve as an academic gateway to the study of the North Pacific and Circumpolar Northern land and seas.*
  The International Arctic Research Center will enhance UAF's ability to accomplish current strategies. Increased emphasis is given to the Office of International Programs and student exchange.

The first three goals reflect traditional university endeavors in teaching, research, and public service as emphasized in UAF's mission. UAF encourages interaction among these endeavors

by, for example, recognizing teaching and research in appropriate instances as fulfilling a faculty member's workload obligation for public service. Because of expectations for public service from a Land and Sea Grant institution, the Cooperative Extension Service and Marine Advisory Program are assigned within the UA system to UAF. Indeed, the current emphasis in UAF's planning and budget development on service to the state and development of its economy reflects commitment to public service (1.A.6). The last three goals reflect UAF's position, noted in its mission statement, as an institution serving Alaska, the North, and their diverse peoples (1.A.4).

The goals and strategies for "UAF 2005," and "UAF 2000" before it, take advantage of the university's current strengths in human and other resources, and guide financial resources toward specific areas within the university mission. The goals and strategies of "UAF 2000" gave direction to the budget planning activities undertaken in 1994, in the face of a budget crisis, to generate savings to be directed to specified educational activities and programs. From 1997-1999 they directed the savings from the Retirement Incentive Program toward faculty retention and new faculty hire. Likewise, the goals and strategies of "UAF 2000" and "UAF 2005" formed the basis for proposals submitted by UAF for the system-wide initiative planning process for development and implementation of the FY00-03 budgets (1.A.4, 1.A.5).

UAF's mission and goals were developed with broad input from the campus communities. It is a requirement that mission and goals be referred to in planning and budget development, and as a result they are becoming widely understood by the university community (1.A.1). The mission statement is formally published not only in the catalog but also as Board of Regents Policy 10.01.02 [G2; G1]. The brevity of the mission statement permits it to be more widely published than had been previously possible, such as on tee shirts, letterhead, and as marginalia in publications. "Strategic Plan: UAF 2005," which contains both the mission statement and goals, is published on the university web site and in print (1.A.2).

Since 1996, the university has followed a progressive analysis of its accomplishment toward the goals of the strategic plan (1.A.3). The accreditation report from the 1995 interim review had recommended that UAF add a timeline to the strategic plan and provide yearly summaries of specific steps taken by each unit to move the goals to reality. Key administrators and faculty called together by the chancellor developed quality factors which became a document entitled "Measuring Quality at UAF: New Ideas on Growing Production – Year by Year" [E1.10]. This was a living document in that it is modified periodically as reviewers reflect upon accomplishments, consider other appropriate measures of progress, and set meaningful yearly goals. These measures grew to sixteen, grouped to address the following:

- More student success.
- Meeting changing needs of Alaska's workforce.
- Targets and actions for enrollment growth.
- Growing faculty productivity.
- Helping ourselves – even more (alternative resources).
- Strengthening the learning environment.
- Graduation rates.

The indicators in this document, with some modification, were incorporated into "UAF 2005." The twelve new indicators were chosen to be few in number so they could be easily remembered

and require little in the way of gathering of new data, to ensure that information would indeed be available from routinely published data.

The chancellor has held yearly meetings for deans and directors, key staff, and faculty and student governance leaders to review goals and progress toward them, analyze the current environment, and set short-term objectives. University Relations provides the university community and the general public with progress reports on faculty, staff, student, and institutional achievements, generally cast as short news items of interest rather than as formal documents. These reports are presented through a variety of media including the faculty and staff newsletter and web site, convocations, e-mail to list-serve subscribers to campus news services, updates to the Chancellor's Board of Visitors, the UA system's annual Report to the Legislature, news releases to the public media, and achievement brochures to UAF friends and supporters. Examples of the reports from the chancellor's meetings and university reports are on exhibit (1.A.3) [A1.7].

In the last decade, UAF's substantive changes have been only programmatic, involving delivery of programs beyond UAF's immediate geographic service area. These programs are offered in response to the University of Alaska mission (1988 statement) and Board of Regents Policy 10.04.11 on Inter-Institutional Delivery of Courses and Programs [G2]. As expressed in the latter, University of Alaska MAUs are required collectively to "cooperate in the establishment and delivery of educational courses and programs to promote access to a quality education, minimize ineffective duplication of effort, and ensure the effective use of the University of Alaska's resources." UAF has reviewed the following with the Commission (1.A.7):
- Bachelor of Science in Petroleum Engineering delivered in Anchorage.
- Master of Science in Petroleum Engineering delivered in Anchorage.
- Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Management delivered in Palmer.
- Master of Science in Computer Science delivered in Anchorage.
- Microcomputer Support Specialist Certificate and Associate of Applied Science Program, a UAF program delivered collaboratively by all UA institutions by distance delivery and in local campus courses.

The first four programs above, delivered cooperatively with the University of Alaska Anchorage and using distance delivery technology and practices, were considered a major substantive change under the accreditation status of UAF (June 1997). The fifth was considered a minor substantive change under the accreditation status of each institution (April 1999).

As UAF develops collaborative delivery of programs with other University of Alaska MAUs using instructional technology and distance delivery, such substantive change review is likely to become more frequent.

Appraisal

Unlike previous mission and goals statements, "Strategic Plan: UAF 2000" was widely used. It was designed to communicate priorities—within UAF, to the Board of Regents, and to the public—during a period of fiscal crisis. Strategic planning helped UAF to address immediate financial problems and to maintain movement toward specific goals.

A strength of the current mission and goals statements is that they are embedded in the culture of the institution and are written to encourage actions and outcomes. The statements avoid naming any specific unit as falling within the purview of a goal or strategy. Consequently, all units must consider how their activities would assist UAF in meeting its goals and fulfilling its mission, and how their proposals for new funding would support UAF's priorities. Administrators at the Chancellor's Cabinet level, who have a history of applying UAF's mission and goals to their own decision-making, assert that units are beginning to think about how to improve their programs in order to fit in with the mission and goals. This is in contrast to a frequent past practice of units identifying themselves as already included in the mission and goals and needing additional funding to maintain status quo.

UAF, the university system, and the Alaska Legislature are all focusing on how to measure attainment of the institution's mission and goals. Currently UAF spends an inordinate amount of time responding to external data requests to address externally derived accountability measures. Often these measures are not easily addressed from readily available databases or are inappropriate descriptions of UAF's efforts. UAF, as it develops its own internal indicators and the capacity to readily provide data for them, must ensure that the indicators will also be seen as appropriate accountability measures by the university system, the Legislature, and the public. The university must be able to reduce the time expended on reporting in order to spend more time on planning and program delivery. It must also efficiently generate the data needed to produce planning and accountability reports that are effective for academic organizations and convincing to state and federal agencies. Efforts by UAF and the UA system to create consistent databases and reporting capabilities should lead to a design for meeting data requests.

The continuing currency of UAF's goals of the 1990s for the new planning timetable is a major strength and an indication that the goals are solidly based on the university's culture and responsibilities. This measure of stability is an indication that despite past fiscal turmoil, and even with administrative changes at the chancellor and system president levels, UAF has achieved a sound foundation for planning with its mission and goals and can now focus and refine, rather than reinvent, its planning processes.

Projections

Having just reexamined its mission and goals, UAF's focus in the future will be to develop internally informative accountability measures that are also acceptable to the Legislature and public; communicate the mission and goals, as well as success in meeting the goals, to the university and the public; and ensure that mission and goals continue to provide the major direction to planning, allocation of resources, and activities undertaken by the university.

The twelve indicators of "UAF 2005," the reporting of accomplishments at the chancellor's yearly meeting, and the semi-annual progress reports from academic deans and directors (see Standard 1.B) will provide a means for following UAF's accomplishments. They will supply accountability to the public and a basis for publication of UAF's progress toward its goals.

UAF plans to conduct the next full-scale systematic examination of its goals in 2005.

1.B. Planning and Effectiveness

Planning and accountability for effectiveness occur at both the MAU and the UA system levels. During the 1990s, planning was driven by the need to develop immediate strategies to address the fiscal crisis. UAF undertook major efforts to analyze and publicize academic program and institutional effectiveness for the university community, the Alaska Legislature, and the public. UAF needed not only to track the success of its activities for management purposes, but also to make a compelling case for increased state funding. The efforts and experiences of the 1990s influenced the development of current planning and evaluation processes.

Several main planning efforts underway at the start of the 1990s continue in the present. The first of these was the 1990 revision of the "University of Alaska Six-Year Plan" [E1.12], followed by the companion plan for UAF, "Strategic Plan: UAF 2000" [E1.8], developed in 1993. The goals of this long-range plan, which drove all subsequent shorter-range planning and decision-making activities during the '90s, were updated in "UAF 2005." Individual units within UAF created action plans built on the foundation provided by these strategic plans. The second major effort began when the university reemphasized master planning for development of campus facilities. In 1998, when the "1991 Master Plan: UAF Today" proved to be inadequate as a guide for capital planning, the chancellor reconstituted a Master Planning Committee [E1.4] and formed a Space Planning and Management Office to address those needs. Both are currently engaged in developing a new master plan [E1.2]. A third major planning effort that continues to the present is administrative restructuring. The loss of key faculty, staff, and administrators during the three years of the Retirement Incentive Program (R.I.P.), beginning in 1997, while disruptive to the institution, provided an opportunity to realign key administrative positions and responsibilities in support of UAF's mission and goals (see standard 6 for changes in administrative structure). Administrative restructuring continues on a smaller scale.

Additionally, UAF engaged in three major fiscal planning efforts. The first started in the early 1990s when UAF implemented its first major private fundraising plan separately from system-wide efforts, exceeding the $10 million goal by $3 million. The Development Office, in keeping with "UAF 2000" and "UAF 2005" goals, has continued fundraising by emphasizing the formation of partnerships with donors and prospective donors, including those outside Alaska.

The two other fiscal planning efforts were initiated at the UA system level. In 1994 the Board of Regents mandated "Program Assessment" [G2 P10.06.01; E1.13] as a way to improve fiscal stability and the effectiveness of programs through generation of savings and new revenue sources. UAF developed action plans to find funding to meet faculty salaries, maintain and repair buildings, and develop high-priority programs. More than one hundred faculty, staff, and students were involved in intensive review of all programs. The Board of Regents approved recommendations concerning program and organizational changes involving cost reductions and funding enhancements. UAF made regular reports to the board through 1997 on progress made in implementing recommendations and reaching the goals established for fiscal savings through this "Program Assessment" action plan (1.B.3) [E1.13].

A third fiscal planning effort began in 1999 as a system-wide planning and budgeting process emphasizing the need to develop a new role for the University of Alaska as a leader in the

economic development of the state. Over the succeeding years an initiative process gave priority to funding proposals that would address such needs not only through research and service, but also through emphasis on academic and vocational programs that would help keep Alaska's youth in state. The initiative process represents a major change in the way both UAF and the UA system operate within the state. It provides a framework for accountability and encourages cooperation among the three MAUs. The first budget request prepared under this strategy resulted in the first major increase in the state appropriation to the university budget in more than a decade. (See Standard 7 for description of the process.)

UAF initiated enrollment management as tactical planning for improving quality and reversing a downward trend in enrollment and retention. The university put considerable energy into marketing itself, enhancing its image, and making itself more student-friendly. The effort gained priority in the mid-'90s with focus-groups and analysis of progress on relevant parts of "UAF 2000" and commissioning of formal studies and reports. Additionally, UAF appointed an Enrollment Strategy Board and hired a director of enrollment management planning in 1998 to expedite and implement an enrollment management plan [E1.3]. By fall 2000, applications and initial enrollments had increased. Enrollment management continues as a major effort (see Standard 3).

Accountability measures and evaluation of planning effectiveness have accompanied UAF's planning efforts. In the early '90s the Board of Regents initiated a cyclical system-wide "Program Review" to have all degree and certificate programs reviewed by a team of external examiners on a 10-year cycle. This effort ceased during "Program Assessment" described above. A report on the implementation of Program Assessment was made at each meeting of the Board of Regents [E1.13]. In 1996, with the approval of Regents Policy 10.06.02, the university began to assess the educational effectiveness of academic programs. The board reviews yearly summary reports on the results and the consequent actions (see Standard 2.B). In addition, the system-wide initiative planning and budget process, which began in 1999, includes accountability measures. Proposals for state funding must include the means for implementing and assessing the accomplishments of the proposal. Units with funded proposals must report on this information and chart the expenditure of the funds on a regular basis [E1.11]. The indicators of progress that were developed for "UAF 2005" will be used in evaluating progress toward meeting UAF's strategic goals.

Planning and evaluation of planning effectiveness have been and continue to be ongoing activities at UAF. Systematically connecting the two over time was difficult during the 1990s, but establishing such a connection has been a major current effort with the development of "UAF 2005."

Evidence-Based Description

The congruent timing of self-study for reaccreditation, revision of "Strategic Plan: UAF 2000" for a new planning cycle, and development of a new planning and budgeting process for the university system have provided an excellent opportunity for UAF to analyze its evaluation and planning processes (1.B.8). UAF has used the preparation of the self-study, with its emphasis on mission, goals, and planning at all levels within the institution, as a vehicle to break away from

reactive planning. The chancellor and senior administration have taken care to emphasize that the self-study preparation was not simply an exercise for reaccreditation. It was to serve as the internal critique and evaluation upon which future planning and budgeting will be based. Planning and assessment are occurring at the unit level, as evidenced by the unit notebooks. The university has conducted opinion surveys and outcomes assessments, has invested in infrastructure for institutional research, and has clarified and formalized planning processes (1.B.6).

The revision of UAF's strategic plan (see Standard 1.A) was accomplished with the participation of faculty, staff, and students (1.B.3). However, despite the efforts of the senior administration to encourage inclusiveness at this time and in the past, it was not clear at the initiation of the self-study in 1999 that UAF adequately defined and disseminated its planning processes. Early informal reports indicated UAF's planning process was obscure, except perhaps to senior administrators. Responding to this criticism, in fall 2000 the senior administration disseminated and discussed within the university community a diagrammatical description of the routes by which planning would be developed [A1.3] (1.B.1). The diagram reflects processes that have been developing in the past decade. It is based on the premise that workable ideas are most likely to come from engaged grassroots sources.

The Academic Development Plan created in fall 2000 sets forth programmatic priorities for the next five years (1.B.4). The academic planning process was a grassroots effort in that it built upon the goals and action plans developed by schools, colleges, institutes, academic departments, and the Division of Student Services [E1.14]. Appropriate citizen and university advisory groups reviewed plans developed at this level (1.B.3). Proposals solicited for academic development were guided but not limited by applicable UAF and system missions, goals, and value statements as well as the current initiative areas for system planning and budget development (1.B.2). Following analysis by the provost's advisory groups, of the 189 proposals received for inclusion in the plan, the Provost's Council identified seven "areas of emphasis" and three "programs of distinction." As stated in the planning document, these areas and programs do not cover UAF's best or most important programs, but rather "areas where judicious enhancements in the near future are judged to have the best potential for moving UAF toward the goals in UAF 2005." These are "areas that seem particularly ripe for immediate, significant development in that they build upon existing strengths, have immediate opportunities for development, and address critical needs, particularly within the university and the state." The "areas for emphasis" are Arts and Humanities, Economic Development, Engineering, Environmental and Human Health, Global Science, Renewable Natural Resources, and Teacher Preparation. The "programs of distinction" are Alaska Native Peoples, Arctic Climate, and Fisheries and Fishery Oceanography. The Academic Development Plan is provided in the Appendix [A1.6].

The purpose of the Academic Development Plan is to serve as a guide for fiscal decisions, funding requests, and program development (1.B.4). It was first used for system-wide initiative planning for FY03 budget development. In order to ensure a wide sense of participation and ownership, the university community will formally review this plan in early fall of 2001 (1.B.3) but less frequently and more systematically thereafter. Review in the fall will give UAF an early opportunity to further critique the plan after the budget development process and to modify the plan or procedure if necessary (1.B.8).

The Academic Development Plan also assists in systematic planning for teaching, research, and public service, and their coordination by the provost's advisory groups (1.B.2). The implementation and evaluation of academic plans are, for the most part, the responsibilities of deans and directors who, as the Provost's Council, coordinate efforts through monthly meetings. Three subcommittees of the Provost's Council function as additional advisory groups: the Instructional Working Group, the Research Working Group, and the Outreach Working Group [A1.3]. Each of these groups reflects inclusive participation consisting of deans, directors, and a Faculty Senate representative, all of whom would have interests in the group's area of responsibility (1.B.3). The working groups and the Provost's Council provide opportunity for continuous informal as well as formal planning, evaluating, and adjustment of implementation.

Beginning with the development of the FY03 state budget request, UAF integrated its formal Academic Development Plan into the UA system's initiative process for planning and budgeting. A model shown in the Appendix [A1.8] illustrates how the Academic Development Plan would be integrated into planning and budgeting processes (1.B.1). The provosts from UAF, UAA, and UAS lead academic planning for their own institutions as well as the integration of MAU academic planning into the system planning and budgeting process [W1.1]. When mature, the system planning and budget process will be driven by a stable academic program planning and development process. The system process emphasizes demonstration of how a proposal will meet the mission and goals of the university and its units. The process must assess the proposal's impact on students, academic programs, research, faculty and staff, technology and facilities, and on meeting state needs. The Legislature and the university have developed measures of accountability by which to judge the effectiveness of proposals (1.B.4) [E1.11].

UAF has placed renewed emphasis on campus space and facility planning with the creation of the Space Planning and Management Office in 1998. The director of this office reports to the provost to facilitate connection between academic planning and space management (1.B.5, 1.B.6). A Master Planning Committee, reconstituted in 1998 and composed of faculty, staff, and students, is responsible for making recommendations to the chancellor on the development and use of space within the university (1.B.3) [E1.4]. UAF provided $150,000 to contract with master planning consultants to assist in the development during the 2000-01 academic year of a new master plan for the Fairbanks campus [E1.2]. Additional funds were allocated later to expand the planning effort to the community campuses starting with Bristol Bay.

"UAF 2005" calls upon each unit to develop specific action plans that support "UAF 2005" and other planning documents, such as the academic plan, enrollment plan and campus master plan. The provost has begun a process for yearly tracking of the achievements of the academic and research programs and of implementation of the strategic plan. In spring 2000 the provost asked each academic dean (except for CRA, see Standard 6) and institute director to submit yearly objectives and show how those objectives are related to "UAF 2005." In addition, the provost asked for sets of criteria to evaluate achievement of each objective [A1.5]. Progress reports are to be given mid-year, and a full report of accomplishments and objectives at the end of the academic year. The provost acknowledges the reports with comments and suggestions where warranted. Examples of these reports are on exhibit [E1.17].

UAF also developed during the period of this self-study a process of regular and formal review of the quality of instructional programs, as required by University Regulation [G3 R10.06.01]. These reviews will be based on an updated version of the departmental notebooks developed for this self-study and outcomes assessment plans and results, among other instruments. UAF will review some 150 programs on a five-year cycle, beginning in the 2001-02 academic year. The review will include recommendations to continue programs with or without change, or to discontinue them. The budget for program assessment (currently of outcomes assessment) will be increased by $20,000 for refinement and implementation of the process and faculty development. [E1.16]

The recently formed UAF Office of Planning, Analysis and Institutional Research (PAIR) and the UA System Office of Institutional Research (OIR) have provided analytical data on a regular basis. The two offices have also provided focused reports, such as surveys of institutional effectiveness and opinion studies, when requested. Administered through the Office of the Provost, PAIR receives adequate funding and staffing for an effective and efficient office (1.B.6). The establishment of this office returns to UAF the capacity for planning and management analysis, which has been greatly reduced since 1995 when an office of six was cut to one. PAIR serves informational needs of units at all levels, and is in the process of identifying and developing the analyses that should be produced in support of planning, evaluation, and accountability (1.B.7, 1.B.8). The UAF Fact Book [G5] and UA in Review [G6] are examples of data collection and studies by PAIR.

Institutional research has been greatly improved by the development of Banner, the university system's student, programmatic, financial, and human resources database. The need for readily available and uncontested data resulted in considerable staff investment in time and reallocation of funding from system as well as MAU budgets to implement and maintain Banner (1.B.6). This investment has paid off in the ability to provide believable accountability measures to the public and the Legislature. Banner has contributed to planning through timely access to data (1.B.7, 1.B.9).

UAF's institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning (1.B.7). With the implementation of Banner and the restoration of institutional research offices, data are now consistent in definition and application and are readily available. The ready availability of data has been a major step in empowering units to meaningfully engage in planning, evaluation, and demonstration of accountability with appropriate measures. Preparation of data for the self-study has provided PAIR an opportunity to evaluate the types of information it might routinely provide in support of ongoing evaluation and planning by the university (1.B.8)

The Office of University Relations works with local and state media and community organizations to publicize such things as the results of institutional research and the effectiveness and accomplishments of the university. This office also promotes and maintains internal communication with its print and electronic publications and maintenance of the UAF web site (1.B.9).

Appraisal

Although UAF did not have a formal systematic planning process until 2001, it has engaged in continuous planning to achieve its mission and goals since the early 1990s. Notable examples are the marketing plan, the enrollment management plan, the Affirmative Action plan, and the creation of the Development Office. Planning has received considerable review, evaluation and adjustment, culminating in the review of the strategic plan in 2000, the development of the Academic Development Plan, and the new process for review of program quality. Part of the effort in the current planning environment has been to focus on some of the strengths and stabilities within the planning processes over the last decade. In particular, the goals of the foundational planning documents "UAF 2000" and "UAF 2005" have been constant; the current planning processes have grown from and still use aspects of the processes of last decade; and all of UAF's planning and budgeting activities have referenced "UAF 2000" and will continue with "UAF 2005."

After experience with "UAF 2000" as a statement of goals and a guide for seeking resources, the faculty and middle management were more readily engaged in the development of "UAF 2005." The planning atmosphere was also enhanced by self-study activities. Movement toward an inclusive approach has been slow but ongoing. The Academic Development Plan [A1.6] is scheduled for review in the fall of 2001 to broaden its understanding and acceptance.

Currently the relationship between UAF planning processes and the system-wide initiative planning and budget development process needs to be refined. The main concern is that the priorities of each will not be congruent. Indeed, the strategy for seeking increased state support for the system deliberately excludes at this time a specific budget priority for rebuilding UAF faculty and infrastructure. There are three reasons why strict congruency is not expected: 1) the immediate goal of the initiative process is to increase state funding by emphasizing the university's contribution to the economic development of the state, not the whole panoply of university endeavor; 2) the system-wide process and budget proposal must relate to potential contributions from all three MAUs, not just UAF; and 3) it is expected that MAU fiscal planning will take into consideration other sources of funding.

In actuality, UAF has been able to accomplish many of its priorities. Funding alternatives are available when its proposals are not included in the initiative priorities of the state budget request. These include seeking outside funding, reallocating funds internally, and even proposing a new system-wide initiative priority for development that would encompass the proposal in question.

The self-study has provided UAF with an opportunity to reflect in depth upon its planning and evaluation procedures (1.B.8). In particular, the self-study revealed that the separate processes need to be integrated. Consequent actions have included publication of the overall planning process, development of the Academic Development Plan, and the cyclical assessment of program quality. UAF's planning and evaluation processes are keyed to iterative and incremental changes in the university as it shifts position to meet current and anticipated needs and expectations.

UAF has substantially strengthened its planning process and is positioned to usher in an age of meaningful planning. High-profile planning activities—Program Assessment, rebuilding from the Retirement Incentive Program, the budget initiative process—have demonstrated within the university and to its public that UAF is serious about planning, evaluation of planning, and accountability for the implementation of plans. The creation of the office of Planning, Analysis, and Institutional Research and the office of Space Planning and Management also demonstrate that resources will be reallocated in support of effective planning and evaluation. Stipulations for rebuilding the faculty following R.I.P. was the first demonstration that maintaining the status quo is no longer an acceptable way to face the future. UAF's proposals are to be evaluated against priorities that were decided upon during the development of the strategic plan and the Academic Development Plan. Planning has resulted in enrollment growth as well as increases in private donations, federal grants and contracts, and state funding. UAF enters the new decade with a feeling of stability and an opportunity to plan for growth and development rather than damage control.

Projections

UAF will continue to evaluate its programs and strengthen the planning process and its implementation. In particular, it will do the following:
- Emphasize that the activities of a unit must address strategic planning priorities.
- Strengthen the ties between data collection and decision-making. These ties include the development of indicators of progress toward goals; emphasis on the use of indicators to adjust and refine plans; and identifying internal and external factors that will impact planning.
- Further refine and integrate planning and budgeting processes and communicate them clearly to all constituents.
- Allocate resources in relation to planning priorities.
- Market UAF as an institution that will maintain its fundamental strengths while adapting itself to serve Alaska's needs for the future.

Standard 1 Documents List

Appendices
A1.1   UA and UAF Mission Statements (extracts from UA Regents Policies)
A1.2   Documents describing UAF Mission Statement Revision Process
A1.3   UAF Institutional Plan (graphic)
A1.4   UAF Strategic Plan 2005 (http://www.uaf.edu/univrel/plan/draft/)
A1.5   Annual Report from UAF Administrators Memo
A1.6   UAF Academic Development Plan
        http://www.uaf.edu/provost/academic_plan/index.html
A1.7   Inventory of Documents that Demonstrate the Appraisal of Institutional Outcomes
A1.8   Academic Planning Model
A1.9   Updating the Strategic Plan - Beyond 2000

Exhibits
G1   UAF Catalog (http://www.uaf.edu/catalog/index.html)
G2   Regents' Policy (http://info.alaska.edu/bor/index.html)
G3   University Regulation (http://info.alaska.edu/bor/index.html)
G5   UAF Fact Book (http://www.uaf.edu/pair/factbook.html)
G6   UA in Review (http://www.alaska.edu/oir/Review/index.html)
G7   UAF Home Page (http://www.uaf.edu)

E1.1   Chancellor's Update Newsletters (http://www.uaf.edu/univrel/chanupdate)
E1.2   Draft Master Plan (fall 2001)
E1.3   Enrollment Management Planning Documents
E1.4   Master Planning Purpose, Committee and 1991 Master Plan – http://www.uaf.edu/mastplan/
E1.5   *An Analysis of Public Opinion in the State of Alaska*, Evans/McDonough Company, 1994
E1.6   UAF mission statement in effect from 1988 to 2000 (http://www.uaf.edu/univrel/mission/)
E1.7   UA mission statement in effect from 1983 to 2000
E1.8   Strategic Plan: UAF 2000 – http://www.uaf.edu/univrel/plan/
E1.9   Chancellor's Workshop Reports
        ▪ Workshops Reports, 1997, 1998, 1999
        ▪ Conference Report, 2000
        ▪ Provost Reichardt Memo Regarding Chancellor's Spring 2000 Conference
E1.10   Measuring Quality at UAF: New Ideas on Growing Production Year by Year
E1.11   The Accountability Report – http://www.accountability.alaska.edu/
E1.12   1990 University of Alaska Six-Year Plan
E1.13   Program Assessment Documents: UAF Action Plan and last summary sheet
E1.14   Academic Planning Process – http://www.uaf.edu/provost/fy03/index.html
E1.15   Review of Graduate Programs: http://www.uaf.edu/gradsch/programreview.html
E1.16   Spring 2000 memo from Provost to deans/directors on program review process
E1.17   Annual Reports from UAF Administrators
E1.18   Cornerstone newsletters (http://www.uaf.edu/univrel/cornerstone/)
E1.19   *Economic Impact of the University of Alaska,* McDowell Group, 1998
E1.20   *A Survey of the Higher Education Priorities and Needs of Alaska Households,*
        McDowell Group, 1998

E1.21 Noel Levitz Institutional Priorities Survey, 2000
E1.22 *University of Alaska Employee Opinion Survey,* Statewide Office of Human Resources, 1999
E1.23 Student Housing Business Plan by Brailsford and Dunlavery, 1999
E1.24 Reports of Specialized Accreditation
E1.25 George Kaludis Associates, Inc. June 1992 Phase I Report
E1.26 Career Services Graduation Reports 1998, 1999, 2000
E1.27 University of Alaska Scope and Role, 1997
E1.28 Progress Toward Year 2000 Strategic Goals Preliminary Analysis and Working Document, Chancellor Wadlow, August 1998
E1.29 Documents Regarding Planning, Analysis and Appraisal of Institutional Outcomes
- Summary of Things Deans and Directors Would Like Changed in Five Years, 2000
- Progress Report on Five Year Changes, 2001
- UAF Administrative Services in Support of Strategic Plan: UAF 2000
- Strategic Planning Leadership Committee Memo, February 1996
E1.30 Key Performance Measures for FY2002 (often referred to as "Missions and Measures")

Additional Web Sites
W1.1 Statewide Planning for Initiatives   http://www.alaska.edu/swacad/
W1.2 Graduate Enrollment and Productivity   http://www.uaf.edu/gradsch/Statistics.html