UAS
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
SOUTHEAST

learn · engage · change

University of Alaska Southeast

A distinctive learning community

Office of the Provost

Juneau · Ketchikan · Sitka

MEMORANDUM

To: Gwen Gruenig
            Associate Vice President-Institutional Research & Analysis
From: Rick Caulfield, Provost
Through: John Pugh, Chancellor
Date: July 3, 2013
Re: UAS Peer Institutions Revision

The UAS Strategic and Assessment Planning Executive Committee recently reviewed the existing self-defined peer institutions for UAS, seeking greater alignment with the current UAS mission and core themes. This memo documents our decision to modify the list of those peer institutions, as described below.

After careful review of the previously self-defined peer institutions chosen more than 10 years ago, we endorse the following institutions as a revised peer group for UAS:

126182	Adams State College
127556	Colorado Mesa University
219082	Dakota State University
208646	Eastern Oregon University
182306	Great Basin College
188058	Northern New Mexico College
219277	Oglala Lakota College
228501	Sul Ross State University
229018	The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
141565	University of Hawaii at Hilo

In making this revision we first compiled a list of institutions with potential for inclusion, comprised of our current self-defined peers, peers identified by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), size-matched institutions in the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE), and institutions isolated from a road system. We also considered institutions identified by respondents to a WICHE list serve request seeking institutions where a community college mission is fully incorporated with baccalaureate and graduate missions. Additional candidates were identified through a search for tribal colleges and Alaskan institutions using the School Search tool offered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), at nces.ed.gov.

The UAS Strategic and Assessment Planning Executive Committee then went through a process of reviewing and prioritizing candidate institution elements in NCES. The elements were categorized as "institutional characteristics" (such as institution size), "degrees conferred" (representing a graduation rate and the spread of awards across degree levels), and "financial" (including state appropriations, the cost of tuition, and financial aid metrics). The Committee identified which data elements should be used, what constituted a "match" to UAS for a given data element, and ranked the "degrees conferred" category as most important. The number of matches for a candidate was tallied by category. The category score was weighted proportionate to the number of data elements in each category to determine strength of contribution to the total. Then a multiplier was applied representing the ranking of importance. The tallies were multiplied by the strength of contribution and the importance ranking to arrive at a final weighted score.

Cc: Saltanat Schweitzer, Director, Statewide Institutional Research & Analysis
        Diane Meador, UAS Institutional Effectiveness