

Defining & Assessing Mission Fulfillment – NWCCU Standards 1 & 5

- **NWCCU 1.A.2:** “The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.”
 - **Yr. 1 2011 UAS Self-Evaluation Report:** “With the Strategic and Assessment Plan only recently completed and approved (June 2011), UAS has set in place the basic framework to determine what mission fulfillment means and how to measure it. This will include developing appropriate performance rubrics and establishing acceptable thresholds.”
 - **Yr. 1 2011 NWCCU Response:** “Mission fulfillment for UAS is developing, but little substantive content was covered in the self-study.”
 - **Yr. 1 2011 NWCCU Recommendation:** “The institution should articulate the acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment for all identified indicators in the Standard One report.”
- **NWCCU 1.B.2:** “The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes.”
 - **Yr. 3 2013 UAS Self-Evaluation Report:** “Mission fulfillment will be measured by the extent to which indicators for each core theme have been reached or demonstrate consistent improvement.”
 - **Yr. 3 2013 NWCCU Response:** “Two observations can be made about the indicators:
 - (1) Not all have clear achievement targets... Many of the indicators said ‘increase the number...’ without any target for the increase.
 - (2) The thirty-five indicators represent a wide range of data points. The report does not indicate how these points will be prioritized, integrated, and analyzed.”
- **FY17 Strategic Priorities:** “Document mission fulfillment through metrics that are mission-centered, systemic, and meaningful.”
- Strategic Plan developed in 2010, approved in 2011
- Core theme objective performance measures developed in 2011
- Core theme objective performance measures revised in 2015
- UAS Committee for Research and Creative Activities proposed revisions to core theme four performance measures in spring 2016, further review provided by Faculty Senate
- Final approval needed from SPBAC for the draft performance measures.

Resource & Capacity – NWCCU Standard 2

- **NWCCU 5.B.1:** “Within the context of its mission and characteristics, the institution evaluates regularly the adequacy of its resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations to document its ongoing potential to fulfill its mission, accomplish its core theme objectives, and achieve the goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.”
- **NWCCU 2.B.: Human Resources**
 - FY16 Program Review Feedback
 - Positive responses on faculty support; adequate staffing. Insufficient time for faculty to pursue training and development. Faculty appreciate the recent growth in professional development funds and Wilson Fund.
- **NWCCU 2.C.: Educational Resources**
 - This is currently not addressed in program review reports; this is better addressed by each program’s assessment plan.
- **NWCCU 2.D.: Student Support Resources**
 - FY16 Program Review Feedback
 - Overall, positive responses. Positive feedback on Sitka Student Success Center. Concerned about instructional design support no longer on-site in Sitka. Request for support in developing marketing materials for individual programs. Campus advisers are not always familiar with Career Ed. programs. Faculty advising has worked well; relies on dedicated faculty.
- **NWCCU 2.E.: Library and Information Resources**
 - FY16 Program Review Feedback
 - All very positive responses; good support for Sitka and Ketchikan. “Where holdings are insufficient, the rapid availability of inter-library loan materials more than compensate for the shortcomings.”
- **NWCCU 2.F.: Financial Resources**
 - FY16 Program Review Feedback
 - Most stated that their program receives adequate financial resources. TVEP funding is integral. Concern about future revenue due to GF cuts and increased workload due to reductions in tenure track faculty.
- **NWCCU 2.G.: Physical and Technological Infrastructure**
 - FY16 Program Review Feedback
 - Significant remodels at TEC were helpful. Access to the UAS network from TEC can be problematic – limited support in the evenings. Relying on partners for space and equipment needs for teaching SCUBA can be time consuming and expensive. Faculty encourage IT to purchase and support Apple computers.