Patrick Gamble, President
Phone: (907) 450-8000
Fax: (907) 450-8012
Email: ua.president@alaska.edu

202 Butrovich Building
910 Yukon Drive
P.O. Box 755000
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5000

! "#" ! "$"%"&" ' "(")" ! "

(&*#+" " ,-./-01"234"2355"

*$+" ").67809%:1";<"&=-9>-"?;@@/.6:1""

A%$!+" " B-:"C-@D=84"B089%E8.:"

F)G,#?*+" *H8"A69H80"%8I;0:"

#-0=1"%."@1"-II;6.:@8.:":;":H8"B089%E8.:J9"$<<%K84":H-.>9":;":H8"I0;<899%;.-="%.:8089:"-.E"9:0;.L"9/II;0:"D1":H8"%-9@/9;."
A;/.E-:6;.4"M"K;@@%99%;.8E"-."8N:80.-="%.9:6:/:6;.-="087%8O";<":H8").67809%:1";<"&=-9>-"P)&Q"919:8@R""*;E-1"M"-@"08=8-9%.L":H8"
A69H80"%8I;0:"<;0"L8.80-="E69:06D/:6;.R""M:"69".;:"-"S/6K>"08-E4".;0"69"6:"-"D=/8I06.:":;"D8"<;=;O8E"E;L@-:6K-=1R""(0R"A69H80"69"-"
/.67809%:1"I089%E8.:"8@806:/9"-.E"-".;:8E"-/:H;0";.":H8"9/DT8K:";<"/.67809%:1"=8-E809H6IR""U8"-.E"H69":8-@";<"8NI80:9"H-78"
L678."/9".;:";.=1":H8"D8.8<6:";<"18-09";<"8NI80%8.K84"D/:":H8"D8.8<6:";<":H8%0"8N:8.9%78"%.9:6:/:6;.-="0898-0KH"-9"O8=R""*H69"69"
.;:"-"08I;0:"K-0ER""M."@;9:"9/DT8K:"-08-9":H8"08I;0:"9/LL89:9"OH808"O8"<6:"%."08=-:6;.":;";:H80"I880";0".8-0"I880"/.67809%:689"
<;0"6=/9:0-:6;."I/0I;989R""VH808"O8"@-0>8E=1"E6<<804"%:"-9>9"WOH1RX"(0R"A69H80J9"%.:8.:6;."69".;:":;"D8"I089K06I:678R""*H8"08I;0:"
E;89".;:"K;.:-6."-"KH8K>=69:R""*H8"A69H80"08I;0:"E;89".;:4"H;O87804"9H1"-O-1"<0;@"699/6.L"-"I089K06I:6;."OH808":H8"91@I:;@9"
-08"K;@I8=6.LR""

*H8"A69H80"%8I;0:"I0898.:9"/9"O6:H"-":6@8=1";II;0:/.6:1":;"L8:";/0":H6.>6.L"D8::80";0L-.6Y8E"D8<;08"O8"D8L6."O;0>";."
/IE-:6.L":H8")&"919:8@"9:0-:8L6K"I=-.R""M:"6.K=/E89";D9807-:6;.9"-.E"9/LL89:6;.9":H-:4"OH8."K;@D6.8E"O6:H";:H80"-.-=1989"
9/KH"-9":H8"233Z"!-K*-LL-0:[%;L809"9:/E1";<":H8")&"F19:8@4"-=;O9"/9":;"89:-D=69H":08.E94"086.<;0K8";0"E69I8="I0876;/9"
K;.K=/9%;.94"-.E"98:":H8"9:-L8"<;0".8O"E608K:6;.9R""\8:":H8"08-E80"D8O-08R""F;@8"O6=="9/08=1"%E8.:6<1"<-/=:9]I80H-I9"-."
-9980:6;.":H-:"69";D76;/9=1".;:":;;"-II=6K-D=8"H808"%."&=-9>-4"-.E"9;";.R""G/:"E;".;:"@->8":H8"@69:->8";<"=8::6.L"-"<8O";<<^
:-0L8:"<0-L@8.:9";D9K/08":H8"K08E6D6=6:1"-.E"7-=/8"%.H808.:":H0;/LH;/:":H8"OH;=8"08I;0:R""""

(0R"A69H80":;/KH89;."-"O6E8"-00-1";<"I0;L0-@9"-.E"699/89"%."7-016.L"E8L0889";<"E8:-6=4"D;:H"I;96:678"-.E".8L-:678R""M:"69"@1"
6.:8.:6;.":";"8.L-L8";/0"=8-E809H6I"-.E"L;780.-.K8":-=8.:"-=="-K0;99")&":;"6E8.:6<1"-.E"-EE0899":H8"08I;0:J9"</.E-@8.:-="
:H8@89R""VB"O6="@8:H;E6K-=1"87-=/-:8":H898":H8@89"-.E"=6.>";/0"9/D98S/8.:"-K:6;.9":;"E89%08E";/:K;@89":H0;/LH"L;;E"
I=-..6.LR""M.";:H80"O;0E94";/0"089I;.989"O6=".;:"D8"E89%L.8E":;"-EE0899"8-KH"KO6:6S/8"I80"984"@-.1";<"OH6KH"-08"96@I=1"
6=/9:0-:678";0"91@I:;@-:6K"E-:-"I;6.:9R""VB"O6="O-.:":;"D08->";/:"H6LH";0E80"9:08.L:H94"KH-=8.L89"-.E"I0;D=8@9R"(0R"A69H80J9"
08I;0:"O6=="8.-D=8"/9":;"%E8.:6<1"@;08"K=8-0=1"-K:6;.9":H-:"K;/=E"=8-E":;":H8"E89%08E"8<<8K:9"O8"988>"<0;@"<;=;O6.L";/0"
9:0-:8L6K"I=-.R""*H808"69"-"L08-:"E8-=";<"K;@I=8N6:1":H-:"KH-0-K:80%Y89"@/KH";<"OH-:"(0R"A69H80J9":8-@"I;6.:9";/:"-.E".;:"@/KH"
:;"D8"H-E"%.":H8"W=;O"H-.L6.L"<0/6:X"K-:8L;01]S/6K>"08-K:6;.9"T/9:"O-6:6.L"<;0"-"9.-I"T/EL@8.:[E8K%96;I/D=6K"@88:6.L9"O8"O6=="-..;/.K8

"

:H8"K;@6.L"O88>9"-.E"@;.:H9R"" ';O4"I=8-98"8.T;1"-"L;;E":H6.>"I68K8R"

`;/"K-."<6.E":H8"08I;0:"-:"H::I+[[OOOR-=-9>-R8E/[<6=89[I089[A6.-=A69H80%8I;0:RIE<[R"

number of academic programs offered, the volume of funded research activity, the institutions'

Student enrollment at the various units of the University of Alaska has grown significantly in recent years and now approximates 33,000

There is general agreement that the University has become a major engine for economic development in Alaska. By itself, it employs more than 7,000 people and has an annual economic impact exceeding $1.0 billion. *"The University graduates good people that I frequently hire,"* complimented an Anchorage business CEO. *"I only wish we could keep more UA grads here and convince more high schoolers to stay here for college,"* lamented another business leader. *–Yes, we are making progress, but I sent my kids to Washington.‖ "Retaining smart people will become more and more essential as the oil industry gradually becomes less important,"* predicted an elected official. *"The University is our best bet to do so,"* he added.

The University of Alaska is a land grant institution that provides expertise in support of state initiatives in agriculture, natural resource extraction, and business and entrepreneurial ventures. *"They are rather good at incubating ideas and helping to start firms,"* praised an economic development official, *"but we need even more of that in the future."* Related to this, a state government official noted that more than 75 percent of Alaska's tax revenues come from petroleum

petrothat more th0eu mo.T1 0 0 1 471.9 3o-11(a)4(ied te)6(rture-8(e)4(so]TJETBT/F7 12 Tf1 0 0 1 220093 5T1 0 0 1 47)]TJE

FIVE SIGNIFICANT FUTURE CHALLENGES AND QUESTIONS

While the University of Alaska faces numerous future challenges, five are particularly significant in terms of shaping the future University of Alaska.

- First, how much should the UAA campus be developed in size and programs and to what extent might (should) this occur at the expense of UAF?

- Second, how can the University of Alaska further improve its performance in critical

While UAF is the system flagship, it is UAA that enrolls the most students (20,368 in Fall 2009 as opposed to UAF's 10,446). These enrollments reflect the reality that the population of Anchorage metropolitan statistical area is about 375,000 (slightly more than one-half of the state's total population), while the population of Fairbanks metropolitan area approximates 100,000. Anchorage's significant growth in recent decades has resulted in the rapid expansion of UAA. Further, UAA is *ña dramatically better institution today than it was ten years ago,ò* according to an external higher education authority.

Persons interviewed including faculty, staff, Regents, and others indicated that high levels of competition have developed between UAA and UAF. –Mission differentiation‖ has become an increasingly contentious issue. Predictably, this has produced a degree of tension between the UAF and UAA. UAF jealously guards its flagship status and the State of Alaska currently would be stretched financially to support two major doctoral research institutions of higher education. Further, most of the State's research infrastructure is located in Fairbanks and it would be quite expensive to replicate it elsewhere. Nevertheless, UAA and many Alaskans in the Anchorage region argue that University of Alaska programs ultimately must be located *"where the people are."* Hence, they assert that UAA's programs must be built up and supported generously. *"This is a painful, but inevitable process,"* commented a prominent Anchorage official, *"and future programs should be put here rather than there so that we don't make an historical circumstance worse. What made sense 100 years ago doesn't necessarily make sense now."*

The perception that the University's programs are poorly distributed geographically is accentuated (at least in the eyes of some) by the location of most of the University of Alaska System offices in Fairbanks rather than Anchorage, or elsewhere in the state. While systems personnel generally receive high grades for intelligence and effort, predictably they and the Board of Regents often receive some criticism for being *"out of touch"* (the observation of a significant number of campus administrators and faculty). The McDowell Group put it this way in 2009 after discussions with the University of Alaska Business Council (an informal organization of non-academic administrators in the UA System): *"The campuses and statewide*

offices of UA are, on occasion, in conflict, competitive, and may lack understanding of each other."

Even so, were the University of Alaska to decide to move significant resources and programs from Fairbanks to Anchorage, it would immediately elicit many of the same *"out of touch"* complaints from Alaskans who reside elsewhere in the state. In the eyes of some Alaskans, entirely too much time, attention and authority already is given to Anchorage *when "it is the rest of the state that represents the real Alaska."*

Thus it seems to have always been so in states where the flagship state university is not located in the state's dominant urban area. The Chicago metropolitan region contains about two-thirds of the population of the State of Illinois, but the flagship campus of the University of Illinois is located in Champaign-Urbana, some 120 miles south of Chicago. Both the University of Florida and Florida State University are far removed from that state's population centers. Analogous situations exist in Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Oregon---to name a few. Hence, Alaska's situation is hardly unusual.

Typically, these states have resolved their situations by maintaining the research campus in its more rural location (often accompanied by big-time intercollegiate athletic teams), but simultaneously developing significant public university campuses in the dominant urban areas. Ultimately, some variant of this model may provide the path that Alaska walks as well.

However, there are three factors that could mitigate against this solution. First, arguably the state is not well enough heeled financially that it will be able to develop two doctoral research institutions of higher education. The State of Alaska would have to increase its support of higher education significantly if it were to seek to develop a second full-blown research university. **(1) UAA's current strategic plan, which needs refinement, indicates that the institution will *"reinforce and rapidly expand our research mission"* and that it will *"build selected research-centered graduate programs."* It is not clear precisely what these statements mean. They could mask wholesale changes, or instead reflect only marginal changes in the current situation. These goals need to be clarified. As a well-placed**

**individual wryly commented, 6RPHWLPHVLQVWLWXWLRQVGRQ¶WDFFXUDWHOLQWHUSUHV
PLVVLRQ´ In addition, the plan should become more pointed, i.e., timelines, costs, source of funds and accountable officers, et al.**

Second, neither UAF nor UAA currently emerge as highly ranked academic institutions in national higher education surveys. While the shortcomings of institutional ratings systems (such as that published by *U.S. News and World Report)*

consequence, the University is substantially an unknown quantity in many academic disciplines and professional schools.

We don't argue that national recognition always reflects actual programmatic quality. Nevertheless, the moral to the story is that the dissipation of resources and a failure to pursue targeted investments in specific disciplines on a single campus seldom are the recipe for recognition and reputational success. To be sure, after reflection, the University might choose to disregard these dynamics. Yet, if it does so, it should not complain when many of its academic programs (and its doctoral research campus) often are not accorded recognition and consequently receive low rankings in national surveys. Mediocrity likely will be the result.

It appears that the further programmatic development of UAA is inevitable and certainly in the long run this is a good thing for the state's largest metropolitan region. However, not all paths to additional programmatic development for UAA are equally sound from the standpoint of the State of Alaska**. (2) We recommend that the UA System: (A) respect the lessons of specialization in graduate work and research and identify a limited number of academic disciplines that will receive special resources and commitment, whether at UAF or UAA; (B) continue to focus UAF on its traditional strengths in the sciences and engineering; (C) focus advanced graduate work and research at UAA on the social and behavioral sciences and education and avoid replicating UAFôs primary areas of expertise; (D) locate any future law school ð the state does not have one currently---at UAA; and, (E) support and expand WWAMI ïtype programs** (**WWAMI is a collaborative medical school among universities in five northwestern states (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho) and the University of Washington School of Medicine) in expensive disciplines and courses of study.**

Improv[ )]C /P 4MCID 5>BDo0t,BDo[12 Torc

University's freshmen retention rate and its six-year undergraduate graduation rate. The performances of UAF and UAS are below national standards on these metrics and hence beg for additional attention. UAA's graduation rate is disappointingly low. Interestingly, the University System's retention and graduation rates performances have improved over the past decade, yet generally still lag comparable institutions by surprisingly large amounts.

It isn't that UA isn't aware of the problem and it isn't that it hasn't made good faith attempts to address its shortcomings in a variety of ways. Rather, the difficulty is that it has not undertaken sufficient rigorous, statistically controlled analyses of the determinants of retention and graduation rates. Surveys of students provide useful background information, but they are not a substitute for rigorous analysis of actual data because what students say and how they actually behave often differs. We describe some of the parameters that might guide such an analysis the section below.

Currently, the University is more dependent upon subjective notions about retention and graduation rate determinants than it should be. One senior administrator opined, *"We haven't been shooting in the dark on retention. It might be more accurate to say that we have been shooting in twilight. We're not certain we're on the right track."* We agree. While all decisions of campuses should not be determined by data, it is better for decision makers to have reliable data generated by rigorous analysis than not to have such arrows in one's quiver.

(**3) Despite improvements, reality is that large numbers of students begin studies at the University, but then disappear. (We note here that the high school dropout rate is also unusually high.) There may be valid reasons why UA lags national standards; if not, then the numbers we observe reflect a waste both of human and financial resources. Whichever is the case, the University needs to determine why its performance lags national norms and then, as necessary, outline how it intends to improve the situation.**

The University generally has performed well in other areas, for example, in terms of generating additional graduates who will fill high demand jobs. It also has done a good job controlling its costs. Illustrations include its work to constrain energy expenditures, its decision

Alaska. In fact, the population of the state has increased more than 130 percent since 1970 and about 11 percent in the past decade. These developments hold both academic and financial implications for the University. Population growth generated by the oil boom brought with it new opportunities for higher education in Alaska. Enrollment surged and UA budgets increased, though closer inspection reveals that University budgets waxed and waned with oil prices because more than 75 percent of state revenues are related to petroleum. Thus, it makes a big difference to Alaska and to UA if the international price of oil is $100 per barrel as opposed to

1 0784.8h to $40 per barrel.0pro3 398tra

Hence, the University clearly has a financial interest in high oil production (though it is wise to note that oil production in Alaska peaked in 1988 and since has declined by about two-thirds). Even so, while high prices prime the University's budget, as an academic institution, it also is legitimately interested in researching the wise use of Alaska's resources and exploring how to preserve its pristine environment.

Almost needless to say, tradeoffs often arise between resource extraction and conservation. As a consequence, the University often finds itself in the middle of conflicts between those who wish to utilize and exploit the state's natural resources and those who wish to preserve and protect them. This is hardly an unusual circumstance in the Western United States, but these tensions can be especially bitter in Alaska and the state's battles on this turf frequently attract the attention and participation of outsiders. An example in point is the controversies that have surrounded 1 307 0 1 483.58mrco

(7) Hence, we must recognize that a reorganization of the University of Alaska is not a cure all for whatever ails it. Even so, it is apparent that some improvements can be made. These fall into two main categories. First, as it stands, the University of Alaska is overly centralized and devotes too many resources to a command and control regulator model that should instead place more emphasis upon incentives, distinctiveness and entrepreneurial activities. Increasingly, under the authority of the President, UA Systems administrators should act as staff to the Board and provide recommendations rather than wielding final administrative authority. Second, the Universityôs attempt to seamlessly integrate all post-secondary education into the same administrative structure sounds better than it actually works. UAôs vocational, technical and community college activities must be accorded greater prominence and not viewed as ³RXU-HW´ (the observation of a sometimes frustrated individual associated with workforce development).

President Gamble and the Board of Regents need to find ways to deal with the two problems just identified. We believe that the University's claim on the state's financial resources will be stronger and general support for its activities if it addresses these two structural concerns candidly and directly. We discuss organization of the UA System in a following section.

One success story that needs to be noted is the improved performance of the University in the area of career, occupational and technical education. UA offers many certificate and associate degree programs that prepare students for work in a wide variety of fields including automotive electronics, logistics, pharmacy technology and paralegal studies at the certificate/endorsement level, and architectural and engineering technology, dental assisting, fire and emergency technology, nursing, and welding at the associate degree level. Over 4,600 UA students are enrolled in workforce-related programs. UA offers almost 90 certificate programs (one-year and two-year) and 75 associate degree programs that fall within this rubric. Graduates of these programs have been able to find jobs even in tougher economic times because employers view them as well trained and responsive to their needs. An admiring employer who hires UA graduates coming out of these programs remarked, *"This is where the rubber meets the road for me. The University is producing people who can work for me and begin to be productive immediately."*

Improved performance, however, is not the same as optimal performance. Workforce leaders within the state still see considerable room for improvement. They assert that except for the nursing and process technology programs, most other workforce-related programs are *ñuncoordinated across the state and often inconsistent with each other.ò* They express surprise that one campus will not transfer in a course from another campus. *ñThey apply four-year thinking to two-year problems too often.ò* As a consequence, *ñit is difficult to gain traction with UA on some of these thingsò* because this isn't their highest priority, or they don't understand.
ETear

Further, language is the repository of a culture; it is essential that UA students come to grips with other cultures, preferably by means of their languages. Both the understanding of UA students and their employability will increase if they acquire facility with a non-English language at the second-year collegiate level. We recommend that UA introduce such a requirement.

(16) UAS's general/liberal education program appears to be substantially smaller in requirements than UAF. The differences between the three campuses are large enough that it is not clear that one could justifiably say the programs are interchangeable. This is odd given the "one university" slogan that UA frequently promotes. Since UA doesn't have rigorous empirical evidence available that speaks to what actually works and does not work in its general/liberal education programs, it is impossible to say whether these differences are helpful or harmful for students. We recommend that UA examine the differences in programs an

Over time, the University also has attracted significant earmarked federal appropriations to support its research work and academic programs. Whether or not one believes earmarked appropriations are good national social and economic policy, they undeniably exist and the University of Alaska typically has done well in the scrum for such funds. Good ideas, time, cultivation, effort and perseverance are essential if one is to succeed in this process. That said, the absence of Senator Ted Stevens and changes in congressional leadership likely will reduce opportunities for earmarks in general. The University has deliberately moved away from earmarks for their on-going programs over the past decade and relies almost exclusively on competitive federal research grants. The one significant exception to this is continued funding for aspects of the super computer program.

Some of the promising avenues for future research endeavors in the UA System include biomedical research, energy-related studies and climate change**. (17) We recommend that the State of Alaska make targeted investments in these areas, as they bode not only address the specific needs of Alaska, but also to attract considerable outside funding. It is plausible for the State to make such investments on an incremental, ¥KRZ¥VKDWRXFDQGR´basis.**

(18) Incentives count where research is concerned and we recommend that the University reexamine how it utilizes and distributes the indirect cost overhead recovery funds that accompany many grants that it receives. We don't have a formula to offer that magically and optimally distributes these funds amongst researchers, departments, colleges and the University. Nevertheless, the comments of some faculty suggest that increasing the distribution of funds to the actual researchers who generated the funds might induce more grant activity over time. These funds also could be used to nudge institutions (e.g., UAA) in programmatic and research directions consistent with the UA System's overall strategic plan.

The WWAMI Model

As mentioned above, WWAMI is a collaborative medical school among universities in five northwestern states (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho) and the University of Washington School of Medicine.

The Alaska WWAMI Program began at UAF in 1971 and for Alaskans now is located at UAA. WWAMI admits 20 Alaskans annually and these students complete their first year of medical school at UAA. Students from all five WWAMI states attend second-year courses at the University of Washington School of Medicine in Seattle. The third and fourth years of the medical school curriculum are comprised of "clerkships"---rotations in the various medical specialty areas that may be taken in any of the five WWAMI states. Students who choose the "Alaska Track" potentially can complete most of these clerkships in Alaska.

The WWAMI approach to producing physicians for the State of Alaska is dramatically less expensive than would be the development of a medical school within the state. A WWAMI-

IV. TECHNOLOGY

The University of Alaska System spends a great deal of money on technology and technology-related items. In FY 2009, the System spent $78.4 million on items labeled as technology; this was eleven percent of the System's total expenditures and represented a 93 percent increase since FY 1999. Technology expenditures per student FTE were $4,453 in FY 2009; on a per FTE faculty member basis, these expenditures amounted to $13,946.

Technology is critical to the operation and efficient performance of the University of Alaska, both inside campuses and between and among the campuses. The huge distances between its campuses require the use of technology if higher education is to be delivered capably. For example, it is 825 miles from Juneau to Fairbanks, 1,100 miles from Juneau to Nome, 1,150 miles from Juneau to Kotzebue, 1,275 miles from Juneau to Unalaska, and 1,700 miles from Juneau to Adak in the Aleutian Islands. All these distances are "as the crow flies." Each pair would involve longer distances if it were possible to drive between them.

It is wise to place these distances in perspective. It is only 711 miles from New York City to Chicago. The University of Alaska deals on a daily basis with distances that easily exceed this. Therefore, the productive use of technology is absolutely essential if the University is going to succeed in delivering higher education across its vast state. UA's College of Rural and Community Development, based at UAF, is primarily responsible for distance learning for UAF. In Fall 2009, Rural College enrolled almost 2,600 students, including 121 at the graduate level. For the most part, these students are place bound, tend to be women (65 percent), and frequently are Native Americans (23 percent). For many of them, distance learning is the only way they can access higher education.

It is important that the System ensure there is no unnecessary duplication or confusion in distance learning. Faculty and students reported courses from separate campuses with the same titles and numbers are often different and transfers can be exceedingly complicated.

The UAF College of Rural & Community Development (CRCD) reports that it delivers distance education to 160 communities statewide by means of both synchronous and asynchronous delivery plus a variety of other modalities such as audio conferencing, CDs, DVDs and the like. CRCD relies heavily on software packages such as Blackboard and utilizes E-Live to supplement CDs. This can be expensive and clearly is subject to economies of scale. For that reason, **(20) we recommend that UA explore the possibility of sharing distance learning courses with institutions in other states and that it give additional consideration to how it might economize by sharing resources with the Western Governorôs University (WGU). WGU offers NCATE-accredited teacher education programs, CCNE-accredited nursing programs through the masterôs degree, and a raft of business programs through the MBA, all via distance learning. The University of Alaska should not casually cast these programs or their courses aside.**

Both in distance learning and on-campus, the University faces predictable challenges relating to the quality of broadband connections to the Internet, high-speed computing and modeling capacity, switches, multi-media classrooms, the number of work stations, the availability of up-to-date software, the ability to service and repair equipment, and the ever present need to train faculty, students and staff in the most productive use of what is available. Nevertheless, distance learning students with the UA System in general have very good things to say about the quality and service they are receiving. They note that UA has become more proficient at distance learning in the past few years (presumably because of Title III funding, though that could disappear).

form of increasing the student per credit technology fee should be considered to begin to remedy this situation.

One aspect of statewide university technology that generates mixed reviews is the Banner student information and records system. The Banner system is touted as fusing administrative and academic functions that make it easy to manage data and give students, staff and faculty secure, 24x7, on-line access to the diverse information it collects and maintains. Many around the UA System do not believe Banner carries through on these promises (*ñIt has given us fits.ò*), though predictably misuse and a lack of training sometimes appear to be present**. (22) A system-wide harmonious student records system is an example of where a statewide approach makes sense. We recommend that the President examine why this particular version meets with so much criticism. Do any legitimate problems that exist reside in the software, how it is managed, how it is used, lack of training, or é ?**

a choice prefer to utilize technology? What measures of later student success (e.g., retention rates, graduation rates, pre-testing and post-testing results, GRE test scores, job placement, etc.) exist that provide evidence on these points?

- What rigorous evidence is there that the ways in which students use technology and how much they use technology make a difference in their performances? E.g., if students utilize a Blackboard chat room, do they score higher or lower on examinations, once one has controlled for relevant demographic variables?

- What evidence is there that faculty training results in additional use of technology in their teaching, increased student learning, etc.? One UA official estimated to us that while

V. FACULTY

The University of Alaska's 2,383 faculty (1,361 FTE) in general are well qualified and dedicated. Many are part of a self-selected group. Either they originally were Alaska residents, or they are individuals who have selected Alaska because of the attractiveness of its distinctive life style and environment to them. A representative UAA faculty member put it this way: *"I'm here because I want to be here. This is an astonishingly beautiful place to live and in my department , we are right on the cusp of new developments."*

Many UA students give high marks to their faculty for their teaching effectiveness and their willingness to spend extra time with them. *ñMy faculty and my advisor always make time for me and donôt stop until theyôve taken care of my problems,ò* remarked a senior engineering major. Students also are pleased that UA faculty often structure their courses to include practical out-of-class learning experiences and internships. *ñI talk to students who attend other universities and here we have lots more opportunities to apply what we are seeing in classrooms than they do,ò* commented a political science major.

There is great variation among UA faculty as individuals and across campuses in terms of their devotion to externally refereed scholarly productivity and performances. Not surprisingly, UAF faculty in the sciences and engineering lead the way in terms of their scholarship and grantsmanship, but more than a few faculty in other disciplines and on other campuses publish books with reputable presses, author articles in well-regarded journals, perform artistically, and compete successfully for extramural funding. Nevertheless, taken overall as a group across all sixteen sites, UA faculty are not exceptionally active as scholars. Substantial proportions of them regard high quality teaching as their primary responsibility.

It's fair to say that many faculty, though certainly not all, are reasonably well satisfied with their situation. *"Given the recession and everything else going on, we're not doing too badly,"* averred a faculty member. True, they harbor a variety of gripes and complaints about salaries, research support, teaching loads, office space, computer support, travel money, parking, etc. Further, faculty on some campuses believe they are *"being stifled"* by a variety of forces

located somewhere else, usually either in Fairbanks or Juneau. Still, most believe that *"we are doing something important here and making a real difference."* Most believe the University has been led very capably over the past decade by now departed President Mark Hamilton and are very pleased with the appointment of new President Patrick Gamble.

The notion that the University of Alaska favors UAF over other campuses does occupy the minds of some faculty and legislators. The *Anchorage Daily News* (30 January 2010) reported the perception of a legislator that the Board of Regents favors UAF over other campuses. It appears that more than a few faculty not located at UAF believe some variant of this and several noted to us that fewer than 6,000 students actually attend classes on the UAF campus proper. One noted that the student/faculty ratio is 12:1 at UAF, but 19:1 at UAA (numbers also reported in *U.S. News and World Report*). The Board of

The UAFT bargaining unit is a somewhat unusual arrangement and apparently was designed –to take care of‖ community college and vocational-technical college faculty when those individuals were merged into the greater, more expansive University of Alaska. Bipartite faculty in the UAFT are those who pursue duties constituting four parts teaching and one part service, while tripartite faculty pursue duties involving four parts teaching and one part research. Much more unusual, however, is the notion of the –bipartite‖ and –tripartite‖ faculty members in the UNAC bargaining unit. The UNAC bipartite faculty may have duties composed of research and service, or of teaching and service in any proportion. Tripartite faculty in UNAC have workloads comprised of research, teaching and service with workloads ranging from 5 to 90 percent in any one category. The current collective bargaining agreement (CBA) for UNAC faculty expires on 31 December 2010, while the UAFT CBA expires on 30 June.

(28) The UAFT agreement recognizes that community college, community campus and vocational-technical college faculty are different individuals with different responsibilities. We agree and note that the differing missions and scope of these units is one of the reasons why it would be wise to differentiate further the four-year institutions (UAF, UAA and UAS) from the UAFT-oriented units, and administer them and record their results separately. Elsewhere, we report comments of work force development leaders that all things considered, they would prefer a different administrative arrangement that would better recognize the distinctive nature of the community college/work force mission. We believe their concerns are valid. **(29) Further, we cannot help but note that UAF, UAA and UAS would not be savaged so much in national rating systems if their retention and graduation numbers did not include students from the community campuses who have not already earned an associate degree. We regard this as a win-win proposition for all concerned and recommend that the President move in this direction.**

The CBAs cover the usual topics---faculty status and evaluation, reductions in force, disciplinary actions, workloads, compensation, etc. In the fashion of most other CBAs, the UNAC agreement constrains the ability of the Board, the President and the Chancellors to take certain actions and requires them to take other actions. For example, faculty are responsible for 30 "work load units" per academic year; these units are derived from faculty members' teaching,

research and service activities. Unusual for a CBA, however, is the fact that the precise number of work load units associated with instances of each of these activities is not specified.

Minimum faculty salaries by rank are specified in the UNAC CBA (for example, $55,000 annually for a full professor). The emphasis is upon *"across the board"* salary increments (3.4 percent in FY 10 and 3.5 percent in FY 11). Allowance is made for market salary adjustments, but the size of these is limited to 5.48 percent of the total base payroll of CBA unit members as of 15 November 2007. Market salary adjustments and initial salaries are supposed to pay heed to the 2008 Oklahoma State University (OSU) national faculty salary survey. This turns out to be highly beneficial to faculty at UAA and UAS because the OSU study numbers tend to pump salaries in those locations, but disadvantageous for UAF because the OSU study results in salary quotations for UAF faculty that often are below national averages for doctoral research institutions. Reliance upon the Oklahoma State study also has resulted in seemingly overly generous or even unmerited raises for some faculty whose less than scintillating performances are the reason their salaries fall below the Oklahoma State standards. The result is a distorted salary structure that is a merit-killer.

In any case, the most important salary decision ever made in the life of any University of Alaska faculty members usually is the determination of his/her initial salary. Virtually everything else is built on that initial contractual salary number. If you start behind, then you tend to stay behind. If you start ahead, then you tend to stay ahead. AAUP data reveal that UAF, UAA and UAS faculty tend to start their professorial lives with approximately the same salaries. This situation does not change as these faculty accumulate seniority and are promoted in rank. This is despite the fact that their duties often are very different and they are hired in different salary markets.

The problem, then, is that the UAF, UAA and UAS units are all being treated as if they are operating in the same salary markets and are hiring the same kinds of faculty. However, this is not so. **(30) We recommend that the President give very strong consideration to negotiating changes in the CBA that will provide more faculty salary flexibility among the**

State of Alaska, the switch in 2006 from a defined benefit pension program to a defined contribution program likely will avert major financial problems for the state in the future.

(31) We have two recommendations with respect to the UNAC CBA. First, the President should work to increase the share of the total salary pie devoted to market and merit raises. If the State and the University truly believe in excellence, then they should reward it.

- UA Fairbanks faculty are not well paid by national doctoral research university standards.

- The salary gap between UA Fairbanks and UA Anchorage faculty is larger than it should be.

Each of these assertions can be examined by means of American Association of University Professors (AAUP) salary data and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) cost-of-living data.

Are UA faculty underpaid relative to national salary norms? The table below reports AAUP salary data for the 2009-2010 academic year.

AAUP FACULTY SALARY DATA, 2009-2010, BY RANK
(000s)

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor

Lewis & Clark C	$58.1	$48.3	$42.1	-------

The assertion that UA faculty in general are not well paid by national standards is only partially correct. It is true at UAF lags national averages for doctoral research institutions, which pay far higher salaries than does UAF. On the other hand, when UAA and UAS are compared to

VI. STUDENTS

The more than 33,000 University of Alaska students are diverse in a variety of ways. Approximately 60 percent are women and 15 percent are Alaska Natives/American Indians. Hispanics and Asians account for about eight percent of headcount enrollment and African-

significant increases in the proportion of highly talented Alaska high school graduates who chose to remain in the state for their higher education. In 1999, 33 percent of high school graduates eligible to become a UA Scholar enrolled at an institution in Alaska; by 2009, this had risen to 43 percent. More than 83 percent of UA Scholars are retained in Alaska between their freshmen and sophomore years; the UA System average is 76 percent for those students who are seeking baccalaureate degrees. While UAA enrolls the most UA Scholars, UAF enrolls the highest percentage of UA Scholars within its student body. More than 66 percent of UA Scholars are women.

Historically, Alaska has been challenged by "brain drain." Many of its young people, including some of its highest academic achievers, have departed the state after high school graduation and have not returned. The Alaska Scholars Program addresses this problem. **(34) We strongly commend the Alaska Scholars program, but nevertheless recommend that the President probe its effectiveness along with the Universityôs other financial aid programs. To wit, precisely how successful are all of the University's scholarship programs**

Student Retention and Graduation Rates

According to the data the University of Alaska provided *U.S. News and World Report*, the freshmen retention rates and six-year after matriculation undergraduate graduation rates were as follows in 2008-2009:

	Freshmen Retention Rate	Six-Year Graduation Rate
UAF		

VII. BUDGET, FINANCE AND AUXILIARY SERVICES

Comparatively speaking, the University of Alaska depends more upon state

Second, since oil prices are rather volatile, the University's potential state funding sources are similarly volatile. The University can, and has, ameliorated this problem by increasing its non-state support (for example, from tuition, auxiliary services, research grants, etc.). Plausibly, it will need to do this even more often in the future

without needs and might well find it attractive to float bonds for student housing or other revenue-generating activities in the future. Suffice it to say that the UA System has the ability to do so though this would require some reallocations.

Financial Carry Forward

One of the marks of a solid, well-run organization is its ability on a consistent basis to carry forward discretionary, unspent funds into its new fiscal year. These funds provide a cushion against unexpected adverse developments and also can be used to deal with attractive, new opportunities. In the case of UA, the oral tradition among some faculty and staff is that it carries forward huge amounts of funds---literally, that it owns an impressively large savings account that could be spent upon deserving departmental and office priorities.

Whatever may have been true in the past, this is not correct today. As the data below reveal, UA overall and each individual UA unit carried funds forward for FY 10, but not excessively large amounts. These levels of carry forward cash are both prudent and appropriate.

UA Overall	3.1% of operating revenues	$23.2 million
UFA	2.4% of operating revenues	$9.5 million
UAA	3.6% of operating revenues	$9.7 million
UAS	3.7% of operating revenues	$1.7 million
USW	4.6% of operating revenues	$2.2 million

Efficiency of Operation

In contrast to many other campuses in –the lower 48,‖ UA campuses in general receive favorable marks for the efficiency of their physical and financial operations. *ñThere is pride of place here,ò* remarked a dean who complimented UA campuses for maintaining attractive grounds, keeping buildings clean, and repairing minor items. Further, there is general agreement that UA campuses typically manage their money well. They consistently receive quite favorable audit reports and one faculty member quoted only a bit inaccurately the Chicago Bears'

the possibility of public/private partnerships whereby a private entrepreneur might provide the capital for and construct such housing, and then operate that housing. Those initial efforts were done some years ago and might provide different results if done today. After some period of time, perhaps 30 years, in a lease to own arrangement, UA would own the property.

In such circumstances, the rental charge students pay ordinarily is higher than normal, though the amenities in such residence halls usually are higher as well. Experience on other campuses is that a student clientele usually exists that is attracted such situations and will pay premium rents for somewhat upscale living quarters. To be sure, this model might not fit many Alaska campus situations, but it should not be rejected out of hand because experience in –the lower 48‖ indicates that it often is viable.

When asked why strategies such as these have not been pursued previously, most informed individuals cited *ña culture of risk aversion,ò ñlaws and regulationsò* (though no one seemed to be able to say what they were), and an egalitarian *ñThatôs not the Alaska way.ò* Other than laws and regulations, we do not believe these constitute valid reasons. (**45) We recommend that the President charge appropriate staff with the investigation of public/private partnership possibilities with respect to housing, but also with respect to a variety of other activities that might be carried out jointly (including partially privatized services, joint research and development projects, real estate developments, etc.). The President and the Board ultimately might opt not to do any of these things, but nevertheless should make themselves aware of the potential benefits and costs before it makes its choices.**

VIII. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Most UAF and UAA intercollegiate athletic teams compete at the NCAA Division II level and those teams belong to the Great Northwest Athletic Conference. UAA's women's basketball team has reached the national Division II semi-finals several times and built several long home winning streaks. UAF teams have won nine national rifle championships. Both institutions' ice hockey teams (men) compete at the –big-time‖ level in ice hockey and televise many of their road contests. UAA attracts national attention each winter with its Great Alaska Shootout men's basketball tournament that historically has attracted many of the nation's most powerful teams.

UAF is a member of the Central College Hockey Association (CCHA), which includes institutions such as Michigan State, Ohio State and Notre Dame, while UAA competes in the Western Collegiate Hockey Association (WCHA), which includes institutions such as Denver, Minnesota, North Dakota and Wisconsin. It seems possible that some type of merger between the CCHA and WCHA might be in the offing because of financial stresses being experienced by some members.

(46) UAS does not compete in intercollegiate athletics, a circumstance we do not believe should change. While intercollegiate athletic teams might improve UASôs identity, community support and student recruitment, they usually bring with them a variety of problems and expenses. Their operating costs would be high and initiating teams would require major investments and general fund tax subsidies for facilities, staff and travel. This seems an ill-advised course to follow at this stage in UASôs development.

The major challenges confronting the existing UAF and UAA intercollegiate athletic programs are functions of distance and weather. UAF and UAA teams must travel long distances to compete against the other teams in their leagues and this is expensive. In addition, the weather introduces a degree of uncertainty to road tp6 1 361.51 150.14 Tm[ )]TJETBT1 0r(n)-9(g)10(e)4rtai

makes intercollegiate athletics at UAF and UAA distinctive and huge money losers on a cash basis. The UAF athletic program received a state general fund subsidy of about $3.2 million this year and UAA about $3.8 million. The opportunity cost (alternative use) for these funds is high. It should be noted, however, that both UAF and UAA cleverly utilize the Western University Exchange (WUE) program to reduce the cost of recruiting selected out-of-state athletes, who often constitute as much as two-thirds of a competitive squad.

One of the most interesting and pleasing aspects of UAF and UAA intercollegiate athletics is the fine academic performances of UAF and UAA athletes, who earn higher grades, drop out less often, and graduate more often than conventional students on each campus.

(47) At the end of the day, however, we recommend that the respective campus chancellors keep a close eye both on programmatic expenses in intercollegiate athletics and the amount of time student athletes are unable to attend scheduled classes because of their lengthy road trips. Intercollegiate athletics have gotten more presidents and chancellors into trouble than virtually anything other than presidential houses. Vigilance, good hiring and observable interest in each universityôs teams will go a long way toward avoiding scandals.

IX.

services, alumni activities, fund raising and most institutional research should be centralized. Individual campuses are much closer to the action.

(50) Note that much greater individual campus autonomy often is sensible in states that boast much larger financial and population bases and multiple large metropolitan areas. In such circumstances, competition among institutions and the development of distinctive, specialized campuses often is highly desirable. Plainly speaking, we do not believe the State of Alaska has sufficient population and resources to permit such unrestrained competition.

(51) The command and control regulatory model that the UA System has is perceived to have adopted over the past decade is in need of clarification and modification. 7KHVWDWHZGHSHRSOHDFWOLNHWKHWHOLVWHQLQJEXWLQUHDOLWWKHWHDUHD PLQGVDQGWKHWSHOWLQJWROORRNUHDVRQDEOH (Quoting comment of an administrator whose sentiment was oft repeated). **Rather than issue *obiter dicta* from Fairbanks, the UA System administration henceforth should emphasize well-designed incentives (often financial, though sometimes in the form of privileges relating to processes and local decision-making) to its institutions. The institutions will respond if the incentives are intelligently designed, clear and the process is not polluted. They need not be dragooned into certain behaviors. Indeed, they will increase their entrepreneurial behavior if incentives exist for them to do so. We note in passing that entrepreneurial behavior sometimes has been in short supply in the Alaska system of higher education. In any case, institutions predictably react negatively to, and even asteedt neoeanrhn msee e h**

(53) One of the more productive functions that the refashioned central staff might accomplish is to encourage the development of joint and cooperative academic programs within the system. The clinical/community psychology doctoral program provides a template for such programs. Courses, faculty and support are shared and students have the ability to benefit from a much larger portfolio of resources and specialties. With appropriate incentives, we are convinced that a variety of other programs could be mounted in the same fashion. We also note in passing that this constitutes a very nice way to provide UAA with additional advanced graduate responsibilities without granting it free-standing doctoral program authority and the concomitant additional costs that inevitably would accompany such a development.

(54) The model we have outlined here assumes that the size of the current UA central staff may be reduced, perhaps in the target range of 60 to 80 positions (down from an estimated 200 today). Note that Virginia, which has a highly regarded public system of higher education, maintains a State Commission for Higher Education with a staff approximating 40. The Virginia system, of course, is less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurially oriented than the UA System. We recommend that the Board allocate some of these savings to the MAUs, some to the support of community college/vocational/technical education, and that some be retained to help provide incentives to encourage desired future behavior.

<u>A New Organization</u>

There are two major reasons to do so. One is that the community college/vocational/technical/work force needs of Alaska are not being served as well as they could be. The other is that inclusion of the performance measures of these units in national higher education statistics and ranking systems has seriously disadvantaged UA.

We do not propose to recreate the former community college system. Instead, we recommend that that each MAU separately address and administer the community colleges, community campuses, and vocational/technical units with individuals attuned to those tasks. For example, at each MAU, there might be a Vice Chancellor for Community Campuses (or however titled).

Each MAU should take pains to see that the same rules and criteria for performance success and failure should not always apply to these units in the same fashion as they apply to the senior colleges. For example**, (56) we do not believe tuition and fees at the community colleges/community campuses/vocational/technical units should be identical to that at the senior campuses. Indeed, they should be lower.**

Further, the statistical results associated with the community colleges/community campuses/vocational/technical units should be reported independently of the senior colleges. This will cure a variety of external visibility and ranking problems.

In addition, in the stateôs two largest metr ¶ ¦ ¶ ¦ ¶

X. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Competition for public and private funds across all states has become intense during the past decade. State colleges and universities have increasingly recognized that the cost of education has made it impossible to compete, thrive, and maintain without a combination of ongoing private gift support and substantial endowment income.

Today, the University of Alaska System is adjusting to 50 years of roller-coaster funding with –boom years‖ filled with impressive

$10 million. The

Although created in 1974, the Foundation has not developed a design for private support. The excellent address to the Regents by the current Foundation Board Chair (June 3-4, 2010) points out problems and a proposed solution. Curt Simic, of Indiana University, has been engaged as consultant; he is one of the most respected foundation administrators in the country.

The question from each of the Review team members is: Why did the Foundation wait so long? There is an impressive Foundation staff, and from 1974 to 2010 is a long time. Throughout this period the Council for Support and Advancement of Education (CASE) and others offered meetings, publications and consultancies on fund raising. We also note here that *CASE Currents*

(60) The key to private support is relatively simple: do it ñrightò and support will be forthcoming, and it has not been done ñrightò in Alaska. The national average for alumni giving is over 17 percent, and some institutions go as high as 60 to 70 percent. The alumni giving percentage is the prime denominator for effective planned giving, capital campaigns and even corporate support. The President and the three Chancellors must each take thoughtful note of this. There are countless publications and conferences available, and Alaska, with its extraordinary academic culture, will be an ideal place to raise support for public higher education. There is only one private institution, Alaska Pacific, and it is relatively small but has a president who appears to appreciate the methodology of fund raising.

provide examples for others to follow, and the Chancellors, with appropriate help from the President, must be in the forefront of this fund raising activity.

Obviously the significant involvement of major constituencies is crucial to the success of any institution’s development program. Students, parents, faculty, alumni, business and government leaders - -

The University of Alaska has an estimated 62,000 living alumni. Approximately 80 percent reside in Alaska. Among the more distinguished alumni are:

- Tom Albanese, CEO, Rio Tinto
- Mark Myers, former Director of US Geological Survey
- Syun-Ichi Akasofu, geophysicist and founding director of the International Arctic Research Center
- T. Neil Davis, geophysicist and author
- Curtis Fraser, hockey player
- Otto W. Geist, explorer and naturalist
- Jay S. Hammond, former Governor of Alaska
- Jordan Hendry, hockey player
- Margaret Murie, naturalist and author

UAF, UAA and UAS each maintain their own alumni association; this is a good start. To their credit, the alumni organizations attached to each campus carry out a variety of typical alumni activities including sponsored events, mailings and Internet contacts. What seems to be lacking, however, is a well-defined sense of their mission and purpose---an understanding on their parts of why they are doing what they are doing. The blunt truth is that there is no reason for institutions to sponsor alumni organizations and activities unless those organizations and activities further the educational mission of those institutions. That is, unless there is a positive connection between alumni events and outcomes that an institution desires---notably, enhanced fund raising but also improved admissions, enhanced fund raising, better placement of students, increased political influence, etc.---there is no reason for colleges and universities to sponsor alumni activities. Universities are not social clubs.

As noted above, the annual fund is the cornerstone of successful fund raising programs but today planned giving is at the apex of the development process. Wills, trusts, and pooled income funds preserve institutional quality by establishing endowed scholarships, chairs and professorships.

What is missing at the University of Alaska is the realization that every alumni event and every alumni activity must be directed at improving the University position. It is not sufficient

for alumni associations to assert that alumni like the social events that they sponsor, or that these events keep alumni in touch with the University. What is required is for alumni organizations to plan and carry out events that demonstrably meet the goals of the university. Thus, the associations need to know precisely who attends their events and what, if anything, these people do for the University. Alumni organizations need to know who reads the materials they send, whether via mail or Internet. They need to know how their social networking sites translate to

These figures clearly indicate that there has been no focus in alumni activities upon fund-raising.

Analysis of Web Content and Publications

In the past two years, news developments surrounding former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin and more recently, the Alaska Republican primary and a tragic private plane crash that took the life of Senator Ted Stevens have greatly expanded national and international exposure of the

Messaging

Communications targeting non-students or prospective students and families (these will be addressed later under –admissions publications‖) are effective in identifying and consistently

palette. Some older publications do not reflect such design elements, but it is likely that many of these will be phased out and replaced with additional web content.

(67) Publications appearing to target potential students and families feature a secondary tagline, ñLearn, engage, changeò (University of Alaska Southeast). This, plus a more consistent brand and family look, might be encouraged throughout publications of constituent campuses. For out of state students, who represent a strong source of higher tuition revenue, the advantages of studying in a diverse, outdoors-oriented Pacific Rim environment could appeal to students in many disciplines.

Major System Publications

(68) Photography is an area that needs to be addressed throughout. As noted, many photos are run too small for impact. Too many are obviously posed, showing either no or little interaction, with subjects staring directly into the camera. In others, such as the front page of the Winter 2009 System newsletter, shots of equipment appear with no people for

(72) The entire piece, however, appears cluttered, with too much copy and some point sizes too small to read easily. Either a panel needs to be added, or copy needs to be cut in length.

Facts, Not Fiction

This piece is extraordinarily effective graphically, with an attractive color palette and excellent content. If it is not presented online, it should be, perhaps as rotating images on the front page.

(73) Other uses for the ñDid You Knows?ò could be explored ð perhaps as tent cards at System-sponsored events, on the back of business cards, as sidebars in the newsletter, etc.

University of Alaska at a Glance

Evidently designed as a companion piece to –Facts, Not Fiction,‖ the color palette and design of this piece are also attractive and readable. The audience for this publication is unclear. The front panel appears to be designed as a generic stand-alone piece, but the back panel seems to target legislators, donors and taxpayers. The two don't seem to go together. **(74) Again, some of this information ï ñsuccesses in efficiencyò could be presented on a rotating basis on the homepage. Copy on the back panel is crowded, and the graphic, ñState Appropriation Comparisonò run too small to be easily read.**

ñTraining Tomorrowôs Workforce Todayò

This piece, too, appears to be designed as a companion piece to –The University of Alaska at a Glance‖ and –Facts: Not Fiction,‖ targeting employers, business, industry and educators while showcasing the vital role of community campuses around the state as workforce training centers. It is attractive graphically and contains a large volume of information well-organized and well-presented. The –Partnering for Success‖ spread could be reprinted as a separate pamphlet for distribution to appropriate audiences and also placed online.

(75) The same comments made above about point size of the font, reduced word counts and use of colored screens behind copy to break up ñgrayò apply to his publication.

Copy reversed over some sidebars with colored screens is difficult to read because of small type and lack of contrast. While the color palette and use of second, third and fourth colors are effectively graphically, design must always support content and messages.

(76) In addition, while some photos are excellent, well-composed and well-cropped, most are run too small to be effective. Use of bullets to summarize key messages is effective, particularly on the back cover, a space often wasted in publications.

(77) In this and other publications, thought should be given to using them as vehicles to driving audiences to the excellent System website, permitting reduced word counts with additional information available online.

Alaska Career and Technical Education Plan

This report is presented attractively and concisely with consistent messaging; although it contains a great deal of information, use of white space, leading and subheads break up copy for greater readability. The high-quality, coated stock and use of 4-color convey a quality image. Content reinforces messages of quality, innovation, strategic planning and accountability found in other System publications for key constituencies. This is a serious, thoughtful, impressive piece.

Other publications (i.e., –Health Programs,‖ –Finance & Performance Summary‖) appear to duplicate information found in other publications and might best be replaced with online content and/or integrated into other publications.

Individual Campus/Admissions Publications

It is critical to an effective branding campaign for the System as a whole that individual campus components, while differentiating their offerings and modes of delivery, display consistent messaging and graphics with publications/web content of the System as a whole. This is executed unevenly in regard to individual campus publications.

(78) Most publications reviewed are those of the University of Alaska Southeast. Key messages and graphic identity need to be better integrated with those of the System to

cross-market the brand. This appears to have been done effectively with campus and the System websites, but individual campus publications need to be taken to the next level.

(79) In regard to family look and graphic identity, the UA System logo should appear in a position subordinate to that of the individual campus identity; color palette and design template need to complement that of other campus and System publications.

Summary

The scenic beauty, abundant outdoor activities, fitness-oriented lifestyle offering synergy with –green‖ academic niches and careers and multicultural nature of Alaska, coupled with enhanced national exposure, offer the University of Alaska System a window of opportunity to upgrade and enhance its web presence and publications to fully capitalize on these strengths and developments.

While the existing website is strong and well-integrated with that of constituent campuses, more thought and focus need to be placed on the plethora of publications. Many could likely be eliminated and incorporated into existing web content. Others, especially in the recruiting area, need to be honed with a tighter, more compelling and focused message on the advantages of living and studying in Alaska. Integrated branding and messaging throughout the System and campus publications would strengthen an already strong external and internal communications program.

XI. PLANNING: STRATEGIC AND PHYSICAL

Strategic

The existing strategic plans of the UA System, UAF, UAA and UAS are notable for presenting lofty ambitions. The plans represent

concerning institutional futures. These are valuable results that are somewhat independent of the content of the plans.

(84) In our view, however, before additional strategic planning occurs, it is essential that action be taken to clarify the missions of the respective institutions and that it deal explicitly with the future roles of UAF and UAA. This may well be contentious, but is necessary if the UA System is to maximize its impact and serve the citizens of the State of Alaska in the best possible fashion. Anticipated future financial constraints serve to underline

maintain

A registered psychologist with a Ph.D. from Northwestern University, James L. Fisher is President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE) and President Emeritus of Towson University. He has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia. He coined the term institutional review and has conducted hundreds of institutional and governance reviews for public and private institutions and systems. He also conducts presidential searches, presidential evaluations and contracts and serves as counsel to presidents and boards.

He has written scores of professional articles and has also been published in such popular media as *The New York Times, The Washington Times, The Baltimore Sun, and the Palm Beach Post*. The author or editor of eleven books, his book, *The Board and the President*, "clearly established him as the nation's leading authority on the college presidency," wrote Michael Worth of George Washington University reviewing in *Currents*. His *The Power of the Presidency* was reviewed in *Change* magazine as "... the most important book ever written on the college presidency" and was nominated for the non-fiction Pulitzer Prize. His book, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, has been reviewed as "...a major, impressive, immensely instructive book, ...a virtual Dr. Spock for aspiring or new college presidents, and ...a must read for all trustees." *The Entrepreneurial College President* (2004) is –…a Bible for those who are presidents…‖ and –…those engaged in research…,‖ *The Journal of Higher Education* and *Interactive Reviews*. His newest book on corporate CEOs, *Born, Not Made: The Entrepreneurial Personality*, was recently published.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at ten private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he presently serves as a board member of the Marine Corps University, Marine Military Academy, Millikin University, and Florida Institute of Technology. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded twelve honorary degrees. At Illinois State, The Outstanding Thesis Award was named by the faculty, The James L. Fisher Thesis Award. The faculty at Towson University recommended that the new psychology building be named after him, and the CASE Distinguished Service to Education Award bears his name.

Biography

Gordon Davies served as the Director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia from 1977 until 1997, and as President of the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education from 1998 until 2002. He has taught at Yale University, Richard Stockton State College, the Teachers College of Columbia University, and Birzeit University in Palestine. He was a founding dean of Richard Stockton State College in New Jersey. Born in New York City, he is a Navy veteran and worked for several years in computer sales for the IBM Corporation. His earned degrees are from Yale University in English (BA) and the Philosophy of Religion (MA, PhD).

He currently serves as a senior adviser to a Lumina Foundation project, Making Opportunities Affordable, and to the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. From 2002 through 2006, he directed a project to improve state higher education policy making. Funding for the project was provided by The Pew Charitable Trusts.

In 2007, he served on a panel appointed by Virginia Governor, Tim Kaine, to investigate shootings at Virginia Tech that left 33 people dead and 17 wounded on April 16, 2007.

During the academic year 2009-10 he taught at Birzeit University.

Biography

Scott D. Miller is President of Bethany College in West Virginia and M.M. Cochran Professor of Leadership Studies. Respected as one of the most entrepreneurial higher education executives in America, Dr. Miller is in his twentieth year as a college president.

Dr. Miller came to Bethany with the same innovative spirit that enabled him to transform Wesley College in Delaware during his 10-and-a-half-year tenure as President of the College and Du Pont Professor of Leadership Studies. Dr. Miller launched a comprehensive 10-year master plan "Wesley College: From Here to 2010," resulting in the construction of $40 million worth of campus facilities including an Academic Village (student residences), an honors house, new athletic complex, tripling of enrollment, creation of a satellite campus in northern Delaware, acquisition of the historic Schwartz Center for the Performing Arts, and the addition of several new graduate, undergraduate, and non-
t

Biography

As chief executive officer of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, James Travis Rogers provided leadership toward improving the quality of education throughout the South. His work involved accreditation of degree-granting postsecondary institutions in an 11 -

Interviewees:
Don Bantz, APU President
Brian Barnes, Dir Institute Arctic Biology
Carla Beam, Benefactor
Joe Beedle, President, Northrim bank
Beth Behner, SW Chief Human Resource Officer
Todd Bergman, Alaska Process Industries Business/Ed Compact
John Blake, UAF AVC Research
Barbara Bolson, Dir Kodiak Campus
Rod Boyce, Managing Editor, *Fairbanks News Miner*
Bert Boyer, Dir CANHR
Tim Brady, UA Regent
Miles Brooks, UAA Student Body President
Roger Brunner, SW General Counsel
Abul Bult-Ito, UAF Professor
Keni Campbell, UAS Alum
Megan Carlson, Academic Project Specialist
Nicole Carvajal, UAF Student Body President
Rick Caulfield, UAS Provost
Tami Choquette, UA Foundation
Steve Cobb, UAA Athletics Dir
Talis Colberg, Dir MatSu Campus
Fuller Cowell, UA Regent
Lori Davey, UAA Alum
John Dede, UAA AsAVO Institutional Effectiveness
John Dehn, UAF Faculty Senate President
Doug Desorcie, President, PWSCC
Pat Dougherty, Managing Editor, *Anchorage Daily News*
Mike Driscoll, UAA Provost
Emily Drygas, UAF Dir Development
Erick Drygas, UA Regent
Larry Duffy, Int Dean, Graduate School
Josh Edge, Managing Editor, UAA *Northern Lights*
Senator Dennis Egan, Juneau
Mike Felix, President, UA Foundation
Ken Fisher, UA Regent
Larry Foster, UAA Professor
Shannon Foster, Registrar, PWSCC
Patrick Gamble, President
Keith Gerken, UAS, Dir Facilities Services

Wendy Gierard, UAS Dir, Ketchikan
Jamie Ginn, UAS Student Government
Carol Griffin, UAS Vice Chancellor Admin Services
Nancy Hall, Facility scheduling

Gail Phillips, UAF Alum
Jeannie Phillips, Exe Officer, UA Regents
Norm Phillips, CEO, DOYON Native Corp
Pete Pinney, Dir UAF TVC
Pat Pitney, UAF Vice Chancellor Admin Services
Jake Poole, UAF, Vice Chancellor, Advancement
John Pugh, UAS Chancellor
Ed Rasmuson, Rasmuson Foundation
Wendy Redman, EVP, UA System
Dave Rees, Alaska Process Industries Business/Ed Compact
Gary Rice, UAA AVP Institutional Research
Gwenna Richardson, UAS Staff Council
Kate Ripley, Dir Public Affairs
Michelle Rizk, SW AVP Budget
Brian Rogers, UAF Chancellor
Beth Rose, UAA AVC Development
Marie Russell, Chair, UAF Staff Council
Mary Rutherford, SW AVP Development
Helvi Sandvik, President, NANA Development Corp
Karen Schmitt, UAA Dean, CTC
Bruce Schultz, UAA Vice Chancellor Student Affairs
Andrew Sheeler, Editor, UAF *SunStar*
Steve Smith, SW CTO

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA STATE-WIDE SYSTEM
REVIEW INTERVIEW FORM

Name	Title	Date

6. ADMISSIONS, RETENTION, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL

7. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

8. ADMINISTRATION (SYSTEM AND CAMPUS)

9. SENIOR OFFICERS

10. BUDGET AND FINANCE (FACILITIES, ET AL)

11. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

12. PUBLIC RELATIONS

Materials Used in the Review:

–Fisher Template‖ for: Anchorage, Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Fairbanks, Interior-Aleutians, Juneau, Kenai, Ketchikan, Kodiak, Kuskokwim, Mat-Su, Northwest, PWSCC, Rural College, Sitka, SW, UAA, UAF, UAF CTC, UAS

Position papers prepared by officers of the University of Alaska

Website information: Faculty Alliance, Staff Alliance, System Governance Council, Statewide Administration Assembly

Organization Charts for the UA Foundation, UA System, and campuses

University of Alaska Anchorage: Campus Profile Kodiak, Anchorage, Kenai, Matsu, PWSCC; Chancellor's Report (May 2010); MAU Profile UAA; Mission Statement; Strategic Plan; PWSCC Accreditation Report (Aug 31, 2009, Oct 1-2, 2009)

University of Alaska Fairbanks: Brochures; News clippings; Campus Profile Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Fairbanks, Interior Aleutians, Kuskokwim, Northwest, Rural College, TVC; Chancellor's Report (June 2010); Directory; Frontiers, Research at America's Arctic University (Summer 2010); FY 11 Budget; MAU Profile UAF; Mission Statement; Strategic Plan

University of Alaska Southeast: Campus Profile Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka; Chancellor's Report (Feb 2010); Directory; MAU Profile Juneau; Mission Statement; Strategic Plan

University of Alaska System: Academic Master Plan; Board of Regents' Recap (Feb – Jun 2010), biographies, Policy and Reg; Brochures; DE Audit Finding Response Report; DE Report – Div of Leg Audit; DE Report – President's response; Dexter Report – Statewide IT Automation Review; Directory; Financial Statements; Foundation Annual Report; Governor's

Performance Scholarship Overview & FAQs; IT Executive Council Report; IT Program Management Report; MacTaggart Report and follow-up; McDowell Report – The Economic Impact of UA (2007 update and Revised draft); McDowell Report – UA Community Campus Impact Study; McDowell Report – University of Alaska High School Graduate Survey (2006 and 2008 Final Report); McDowell Report –