

## Performance Based Budgeting White Paper

College/Campus: Mat-Su College  
 Metric: Student Credit Hours  
 Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose: This template is designed to aid you in gathering information as you prepare your unit's text for the August 1st 'White Paper' submission to Statewide. Item #1 contains historical/current college/campus values for this metric. (Note: a separate template for re-establishing your long-term target is being designed and will be distributed shortly.)

### 1. Historical Trends

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Metric Value</b>	20,480	19,222	20,946	23,486	23,806	20,494
<b>% Change</b>		-6.1%	9.0%	12.1%	1.4%	-13.9%

2. **College Trends:** What recent major institutional and college changes have impacted recent and current metric values? Were these changes the result of strategic planning? Are there specific trends that you are particularly interested in for your strategic planning processes? If so, are there trends associated with one or more of the metrics?

First, Mat-Su College has included summer enrollment in this year's student credit hour count, which brings this year's enrollment to 21,579, or a 7.8% decrease over the previous year and a 7.4% increase since AY 99-00. The figure below also notes college enrollment by course type and sections offered.

**Figure 1. Mat-Su College Enrollment by course type**

	050-099			100-299			300-499		
	Sec	hc	fte	sec	hc	fte	sec	hc	fte
2001-02	30	494	95.8	577	6655	1129.9	56	518	98.9
2002-03	32	572	108.9	654	7698	1317.5	45	401	73.6
2003-04	28	516	98.9	703	8437	1381.5	35	380	69
2004-05	27	456	83.9	647	6435	1111.4	22	242	48.4

Even though we have taken a substantial decline in enrollment this year we are still having the third best year in the college's history. In 02-03 and 03-04 we were severely strapped for space. In order to meet the increased demand we did several things. First we found that the majority of GERs had been scheduled on the same days at the same times for years. That has been changed so that GERs are now more dispersed through the week. Second we now schedule like classes of different levels at the same times. For instance, there are sections of ENGL 111, 109, and 086 at the same times on the same days, similarly MATH 0107, 105, and 055 are scheduled in the same way. This allows movement both up and down for students who have been inappropriately placed and enables them to stay on program sequence.

The college is also working to bring programs on in a blended or hybrid format. In this format much of the class is on-line with occasional face to face meetings. This frees up classroom space and offers an alternative for those students who must deal with issues of time and distance. This fall we will have five classes in this format. Two ECD classes, one ED class, one LSIS class and what we are calling a keystone course. The ECD, ED and LSIS courses are all required for the degree in ECD. We have done this in consultation with the COE and they are quite aware of what we are doing. In the spring we will be offering the AAS and CERT in logistics in cooperation with CBPP. In logistics the LOG courses will belong to CBPP and the support courses to Mat-Su, we will be providing space for the Anchorage campus. We will be doing the same for the ADN program in January 06. While we will be providing the material that our service area desires we will actually be relinquishing space and thereby hurting our own performance metrics to fulfill our mission and enhance the image of UAA.

Please note that the only type of enrollment that shows a steady decline is in upper division courses. These courses have been decreased based on a request from Anchorage that we keep these courses to a minimum. If Mat-Su had those 50 FTE that we have declined since 01-02 and the approximately 250 head count we would not be experiencing a decline in enrollment. For the fall of 05 we are offering 15 upper division courses, 4 in art (weaving), 2 in history, 1 in psychology, 1 in chemistry, 1 in electronics and 6 in Human Services. As of June 1 we anticipate that at least eight will have 10 or more students (10 is our cut off, before I arrived there was a situational enrollment floor)—2 history, 1 psych, 6 hums—4 already exceed that number with 4 more very close to that now, the eighth class is a practicum course for HUMS students and requires instructor approval before enrolling. The art courses are for those students at both Mat-Su and Anchorage who are pursuing an emphasis in fiber arts and there are a couple of majors in that area. The chemistry class is organic chemistry and we expect that class to reach an enrollment of ten. We do not expect the electronics class to “make” and will in all likelihood cancel that class.

Our drop in enrollment comes mainly from males over 40 taking less than 6 credit hours. We attribute this to several things. First, the economy is good more people are working. Second, tuition has increased, so you can make money or spend more money. Third, enrollment policies now dictate that one declare a major. This is not what 2yr colleges are all about. Those who want to take a course or two now find they have to declare a major and are suspicious of that. As a result many of them walk away. Finally, the new residency requirement may be an issue. It now takes two years for people to gain state residency while before it only took one. With over 1,500 people moving to the valley each year from outside this is a sizable portion of the population that we have excluded. Closing statistics from Fall 03 and Fall 04 tend to show a pattern in this regard. The college enrolled 23% fewer non-resident students, 22% fewer people from non-AK high schools, 40% fewer non-degree seekers, 20% fewer males, and 23% fewer non-traditional students. This is meant to show that all of our actions have unintended consequences that we may not see even moving with all deliberate speed.

Other potential reasons for our drop in enrollments is the enforcement of pre-requisites, plagiarism is being dealt with and not ignored or condoned, we have found that humanities

classes have only 1/8<sup>th</sup> the reading requirements of science classes and we are addressing that, many adjuncts are not meeting standards and we are not inviting them to return which decreases the number of course sections we can offer. To make things easier for the adjuncts who do wish to meet standards we are providing a syllabus template on-line for use by all faculty members.

From the spring of 2002 adjunct instructor roster at Mat-Su College 89 of those adjunct instructors, accounting for 130 sections, have been released from Mat-Su College. Some of these instructors moved away from the area or otherwise decided not to continue to teach. A very cursory review shows that 16% of the instructors were not invited to return and account for 20% of the sections they offered. They did not submit syllabi, were poor teachers or did not follow basic appropriate processes. Another reason for this relatively large turnover was based on requests from Anchorage. This is not to say that Anchorage forced Mat-Su to release adjunct instructors, but there has been a push for certain things from Anchorage. For instance the Art department has strongly requested that art instructors have terminal degrees in their area of expertise and that we discontinue ART 101-104. Education and English requested higher standards. The BS in Human Services requires a different level of quality if we are to continue to offer the 4 year degree. These four areas account for 38 (43%) of the instructors not invited to return who taught 67 (52%) of the sections taught. This is illustrative of the fact that Mat-Su College and potentially other community campuses work at cross purposes that they cannot ultimately control. They are asked to do certain things for the MAU which may hurt the performance goals they are assigned (and the goals are assigned) and ultimately and potentially decrease their respective budgets.

**Figure 2. Mat-Su College Staffing**

Mat-Su College Staffing

Faculty	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05
FT HC/FTE	15/17	17/18.5	19/20	20/21
Adj HC/FTE	97/48.5	85/42.5	90/45	73/36.5

While residency, tuition and the local economy may indeed have an impact on enrollment internal decisions may have an equal effect on enrollment. These decisions mark a departure from a numbers at all costs mentality to a quality first mentality.

These actions are partially part of a college (not university) strategic plan written in 2003 and implemented over the past two years. We have also attempted to follow the directions of UAA in terms of not offering upper division courses, dropping ART 101-104 at the request of the UAA Art Department, and working to meet the faculty credential requirements of UAA. Additionally, we have been working to comply with the directions of the regional accrediting agency in terms of the ratio of adjunct to full-time faculty.

The issue of changing from a numbers at all costs methodology to a quality first mentality is a significant culture shift for this campus. Not only is an internal change in culture, but it is a significant change for the local population in terms of expectations and standards. It will take some time for the revised college culture to take root in the community.

3. **Unit Level -- Recent Trends/Current Status:** What units in your college/campus account for the majority of the trend/current status? What units have been increasing/decreasing metric-wise and why?

There is insufficient time to compile a reliable data set to answer this question. Among full-time faculty the R&H program has increased SCH significantly while only experiencing modest headcount gains. For instance, from fall 2003 to fall 2004 SCH increased from 266 to 304 (42 credit hours) while head count only increased by 14, adjuncts actually lost both headcount and SCH. In both cases, adjunct and full-time faculty class sizes increased and the percentage of running at capacity also increased.

4. **Environmental Conditions:** What recent and current environmental conditions, both within and outside your college/campus, have impacted outcomes reflected in this metric? Have such impacts been favorable or unfavorable, and why?

Local economy, UA policies, internal standards, UAA directions/directives.

5. **Operating Assumptions:** What are the fundamental operating assumptions/ constraints that influenced your current planning relative to the outcome represented by this metric? What assumptions have been proven to be valid/invalid, and why?

Current planning has been very broad and certainly non-specific. In the past there has been little planning at the college level. The current director has been here for three years. Prior to that there had been a different director or interim director for four consecutive years. Planning had not been a priority.

6. **Recent Strategies/Impacts/Modifications:** Briefly, what are your recent planning strategies and their associated goals and objectives, actions taken, outcomes/impacts to date, etc.? What role has PBB played in your strategic planning process?

PBB has played no role in our processes since it did not exist at this level until 90 days ago. In the past we were given targets to hit, provided numbers to higher authority and did what we could.

7. **Key Future Strategies/Action Plans:** Describe your current or expected near-term strategic plan(s) for reaching your 2009 metric targets; please include your estimated resource assumptions and processes for making annual benchmark comparisons and necessary mid-course adjustments. Are there a few well chosen actions that might result in a high payoff for this metric? If so, roughly estimate potential impacts. What strategic plans have you implemented in the near past that have/will yield high pay-offs?

We will revise our avenue to reach the 2009 targets assigned.

8. **Unintended Consequences:** Have recently implemented PBB strategies yielded unintended consequences, either beneficial or otherwise?

What are any recently implemented PBB strategies?

9. **Metric Gaps:** Are the metrics sufficient for your strategic planning? What additional metrics would be useful for your college? Are you already using other metrics for your strategic planning processes?

These metrics are apparently used for evaluative purposes. We are more interested in providing a quality education for our students. To do this we have begun to elevate our standards. This may be one potential reason for declining enrollment.

10. **Line of Sight to Department Level:** How have unit heads in your college/campus been involved in target setting and using PBB as a tool in your college/campus planning process? What are your near-term plans for a continued “Bottom-up” PBB implementation -- please include a list of possible difficulties and some estimate of resource needs. What advice/lessons learned have you heard from your counterparts at other institutions on implementing PBB practices? Internal to your college, are “programs” more appropriate than “departments” when considering a “Bottom-up” approach to PBB implementation?

Any input coming from programs/departments will be a first at this campus. This is a change that will not occur immediately.

11. **Additional Comments (Optional):** Please provide additional information you deem pertinent to PBB implementation @ UAA. You may find the “Possible Lines of Inquiry” list provided to you recently useful for this question.

## Performance Based Budgeting White Paper

College/Campus: Mat-Su College  
 Metric: High Demand Job Awards  
 Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose: This template is designed to aid you in gathering information as you prepare your unit's text for the August 1st 'White Paper' submission to Statewide. Item #1 contains historical/current college/campus values for this metric. (Note: a separate template for re-establishing your long-term target is being designed and will be distributed shortly.)

### 1. Historical Trends

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Metric Value</b>	35	28	36	33	36	Not provided
<b>% Change</b>		-20.0%	28.6%	-8.3%	9.1%	

2. **College Trends:** What recent major institutional and college changes have impacted recent and current metric values? Were these changes the result of strategic planning? Are there specific trends that you are particularly interested in for your strategic planning processes? If so, are there trends associated with one or more of the metrics?

The two major programs in this metric are Refrigeration and Heating (R&H) and Architectural Engineering Technology (AET). R&H has changed its scheduling from the traditional start of semester to two weeks after the start of the semester. This has enabled students to enroll and take the entire course since many of them work in the construction trades. This has been a very positive change for the R&H curriculum. AET has been and continues to be strong. Fall 05 enrollments for AET show very good numbers and we should expect a higher number of graduates in the next year or two.

It should be noted that particularly at two year campuses, graduation will lag enrollment by more than the length of the program. A person may only be taking a 1/2 time load therefore it would not be reasonable to expect that person to graduate for 4 or more years.

3. **Unit Level -- Recent Trends/Current Status:** What units in your college/campus account for the majority of the trend/current status? What units have been increasing/decreasing metric-wise and why?

R&H and AET. Both are high demand areas in terms of nearly immediate employment. R&H has changed its scheduling and AET has experienced the removal of a very troubling student who was frightening many other students and disrupting the learning environment. The quality of the faculty in AET has also risen in the last two years.

4. **Environmental Conditions**: What recent and current environmental conditions, both within and outside your college/campus, have impacted outcomes reflected in this metric? Have such impacts been favorable or unfavorable, and why?

Economy is very good in this trade and employment is excellent.

5. **Operating Assumptions**: What are the fundamental operating assumptions/ constraints that influenced your current planning relative to the outcome represented by this metric? What assumptions have been proven to be valid/invalid, and why?

No meaningful planning has been done as of yet.

6. **Recent Strategies/Impacts/Modifications**: Briefly, what are your recent planning strategies and their associated goals and objectives, actions taken, outcomes/impacts to date, etc.? What role has PBB played in your strategic planning process?

Schedule change.

7. **Key Future Strategies/Action Plans**: Describe your current or expected near-term strategic plan(s) for reaching your 2009 metric targets; please include your estimated resource assumptions and processes for making annual benchmark comparisons and necessary mid-course adjustments. Are there a few well chosen actions that might result in a high payoff for this metric? If so, roughly estimate potential impacts. What strategic plans have you implemented in the near past that have/will yield high pay-offs?

We need to see if the current changes are one time increases or have long-term affects.

8. **Unintended Consequences**: Have recently implemented PBB strategies yielded unintended consequences, either beneficial or otherwise?
9. **Metric Gaps**: Are the metrics sufficient for your strategic planning? What additional metrics would be useful for your college? Are you already using other metrics for your strategic planning processes?

Participation/enrollment would be more practical rather than graduation numbers.

10. **Line of Sight to Department Level**: How have unit heads in your college/campus been involved in target setting and using PBB as a tool in your college/campus planning process? What are your near-term plans for a continued "Bottom-up" PBB implementation -- please include a list of possible difficulties and some estimate of resource needs. What advice/lessons learned have you heard from your counterparts at other institutions on

implementing PBB practices? Internal to your college, are “programs” more appropriate than “departments” when considering a “Bottom-up” approach to PBB implementation?

The change in schedule was proposed by the department.

11. **Additional Comments (Optional)**: Please provide additional information you deem pertinent to PBB implementation @ UAA. You may find the “Possible Lines of Inquiry” list provided to you recently useful for this question.

## Performance Based Budgeting White Paper

College/Campus: Mat-Su College

Metric: Retention Rate for Freshmen

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose: This template is designed to aid you in gathering information as you prepare your unit's text for the August 1st 'White Paper' submission to Statewide. Item #1 contains historical/current college/campus values for this metric. (Note: a separate template for re-establishing your long-term target is being designed and will be distributed shortly.)

### 1. Historical Trends

**All data below is in percent, except all grads which is a real value.**

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Metric Value</b>						
<b>All 1<sup>st</sup> Time Fr</b>	30.5	26.4	31.1	36.9	38.3	32.6
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Time FT AA</b>	38.3	41.9	48.2	52.2	53.1	40
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Time non-d</b>	28	23.3	23.9	30.4	34.6	24.7
<b>ALL GRADS</b>	74	69	72	71	77	92
<b>% Change</b>						

2. **College Trends:** What recent major institutional and college changes have impacted recent and current metric values? Were these changes the result of strategic planning? Are there specific trends that you are particularly interested in for your strategic planning processes? If so, are there trends associated with one or more of the metrics?

To increase student success we have limited late entry into classes particularly in the skill center; we have initiated an early alert program (fall 2003) where we contact students if they miss the first two class sessions or otherwise appear to be headed for the dark side; we also have instituted a Hot Tips (Fall 2004) series that helps students deal with test taking, library research and other issues. The Hot Tips are a type of just in time training that usually take place about a week before the requirement is announced in classes. This fall we will begin an on-line orientation program as well as a face to face orientation.

The matter of retention depends on what one is measuring. In terms of keeping AA degree seeking students Mat-Su appears to be doing rather well. Non-degree seeking students have a lower retention rate, but is that due to Mat-Su or other factors? Could these students only want to be here a year and then transfer. If we keep them a year and move them on with all the credits they took at Mat-Su then we have been successful. We are then being penalized for providing for the needs of our community through an artificial measure constructed by an entity that has a somewhat different mission and purpose (MAU or Statewide).

It is interesting to notice in the above data that the retention rate does not have a steady correlation with the number of graduates. Overall retention does fluctuate, but more as a function

of non-degree seekers. This should not be surprising as non-degree seekers may only be here for a course or two and not an academic program per se. If looking at the non-degree seekers this population tends to act similarly in terms of enrollment, retention, and other areas.

One should also keep in mind that the recent policy changes regarding declaring a major may have some impact on retention.

UAA OPRA astutely notes that there appears to have been a shift in grading policy at Mat-Su College since the Fall of 2002. In that year 75.2% of grades were success, 3.2 as stasis, and 15.1 as attrition. In the Fall of 2004 those percentages were 68.1, 4.8 and 16.4 respectively. The increase in stasis and attrition grades may be a reflection of more academic rigor in the Mat-Su classroom.

3. **Unit Level -- Recent Trends/Current Status:** What units in your college/campus account for the majority of the trend/current status? What units have been increasing/decreasing metric-wise and why?

We have not looked at this at the program/department level.

4. **Environmental Conditions:** What recent and current environmental conditions, both within and outside your college/campus, have impacted outcomes reflected in this metric? Have such impacts been favorable or unfavorable, and why?
5. **Operating Assumptions:** What are the fundamental operating assumptions/ constraints that influenced your current planning relative to the outcome represented by this metric? What assumptions have been proven to be valid/invalid, and why?

We assume that many of our students are not here to complete a degree. We know that most undergraduates change their majors often during their college career. At 2-year colleges not only do majors change but life situations change rapidly for our many non-traditional students. Looking at retention in an area where retention for a degree program isn't a priority for many is a somewhat inappropriate measure.

6. **Recent Strategies/Impacts/Modifications:** Briefly, what are your recent planning strategies and their associated goals and objectives, actions taken, outcomes/impacts to date, etc.? What role has PBB played in your strategic planning process?

See #2 above.

7. **Key Future Strategies/Action Plans:** Describe your current or expected near-term strategic plan(s) for reaching your 2009 metric targets; please include your estimated resource assumptions and processes for making annual benchmark comparisons and necessary mid-course adjustments. Are there a few well chosen actions that might result in a high payoff for this metric? If so, roughly estimate potential impacts. What strategic plans have you implemented in the near past that have/will yield high pay-offs?

8. **Unintended Consequences:** Have recently implemented PBB strategies yielded unintended consequences, either beneficial or otherwise?

The recent change in rules for declaring a major may have influenced some former first-time freshmen regarding continuing at Mat-Su.

9. **Metric Gaps:** Are the metrics sufficient for your strategic planning? What additional metrics would be useful for your college? Are you already using other metrics for your strategic planning processes?

Rather than graduation, participation may be a better measure. Does this metric take into account those who started at Mat-Su and then went to UAA? If that was the students' original design then they have achieved their goal at Mat-Su and we have therefore been successful. Under this rubric we could have 0% retention and fulfill our mission.

10. **Line of Sight to Department Level:** How have unit heads in your college/campus been involved in target setting and using PBB as a tool in your college/campus planning process? What are your near-term plans for a continued "Bottom-up" PBB implementation -- please include a list of possible difficulties and some estimate of resource needs. What advice/lessons learned have you heard from your counterparts at other institutions on implementing PBB practices? Internal to your college, are "programs" more appropriate than "departments" when considering a "Bottom-up" approach to PBB implementation?

This is difficult to deal with here as many of our students are actually looking to transfer. They may go somewhere else for a semester or two, return later, but not be counted as retained. The majority of our students are either undeclared or in a transfer program therefore they are not available for bottom-up planning since they have no "home department".

11. **Additional Comments (Optional):** Please provide additional information you deem pertinent to PBB implementation @ UAA. You may find the "Possible Lines of Inquiry" list provided to you recently useful for this question.

It maybe good to consider the impact of tuition. If students can get the same classes for the same price and have more student services and other amenities available to them in Anchorage it makes sense fro them to go to the larger campus where they get more value for their dollar. This would affect Mat-Su more than other community campuses because f our proximity to Anchorage.

## Performance Based Budgeting White Paper

College/Campus: Mat-Su College

Metric: Research Focus

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose: This template is designed to aid you in gathering information as you prepare your unit's text for the August 1st 'White Paper' submission to Statewide. Item #1 contains historical/current college/campus values for this metric. (Note: a separate template for re-establishing your long-term target is being designed and will be distributed shortly.)

1. **Historical Trends**

**Data will be forthcoming shortly.**

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Metric Value</b>						
<b>% Change</b>						

2. **College Trends**: What recent major institutional and college changes have impacted recent and current metric values? Were these changes the result of strategic planning? Are there specific trends that you are particularly interested in for your strategic planning processes? If so, are there trends associated with one or more of the metrics?

Not applicable to this unit.

3. **Unit Level -- Recent Trends/Current Status**: What units in your college/campus account for the majority of the trend/current status? What units have been increasing/decreasing metric-wise and why?
4. **Environmental Conditions**: What recent and current environmental conditions, both within and outside your college/campus, have impacted outcomes reflected in this metric? Have such impacts been favorable or unfavorable, and why?
5. **Operating Assumptions**: What are the fundamental operating assumptions/ constraints that influenced your current planning relative to the outcome represented by this metric? What assumptions have been proven to be valid/invalid, and why?

6. **Recent Strategies/Impacts/Modifications:** Briefly, what are your recent planning strategies and their associated goals and objectives, actions taken, outcomes/impacts to date, etc.? What role has PBB played in your strategic planning process?
  
7. **Key Future Strategies/Action Plans:** Describe your current or expected near-term strategic plan(s) for reaching your 2009 metric targets; please include your estimated resource assumptions and processes for making annual benchmark comparisons and necessary mid-course adjustments. Are there a few well chosen actions that might result in a high payoff for this metric? If so, roughly estimate potential impacts. What strategic plans have you implemented in the near past that have/will yield high pay-offs?
  
8. **Unintended Consequences:** Have recently implemented PBB strategies yielded unintended consequences, either beneficial or otherwise?
  
9. **Metric Gaps:** Are the metrics sufficient for your strategic planning? What additional metrics would be useful for your college? Are you already using other metrics for your strategic planning processes?
  
10. **Line of Sight to Department Level:** How have unit heads in your college/campus been involved in target setting and using PBB as a tool in your college/campus planning process? What are your near-term plans for a continued “Bottom-up” PBB implementation -- please include a list of possible difficulties and some estimate of resource needs. What advice/lessons learned have you heard from your counterparts at other institutions on implementing PBB practices? Internal to your college, are “programs” more appropriate than “departments” when considering a “Bottom-up” approach to PBB implementation?
  
11. **Additional Comments (Optional):** Please provide additional information you deem pertinent to PBB implementation @ UAA. You may find the “Possible Lines of Inquiry” list provided to you recently useful for this question.

## Performance Based Budgeting White Paper

College/Campus: Mat-Su College  
 Metric: University Gen Revenue  
 Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose: This template is designed to aid you in gathering information as you prepare your unit's text for the August 1st 'White Paper' submission to Statewide. Item #1 contains historical/current college/campus values for this metric. (Note: a separate template for re-establishing your long-term target is being designed and will be distributed shortly.)

### 1. Historical Trends

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Metric Value</b>	2,285,613	2,438,168	3,135,000	3,399,800	3,316,000	3,260,587
<b>% Change</b>		6.6%	28.6%	8.4%	-2.5%	-1.7%*

2. **College Trends**: What recent major institutional and college changes have impacted recent and current metric values? Were these changes the result of strategic planning? Are there specific trends that you are particularly interested in for your strategic planning processes? If so, are there trends associated with one or more of the metrics?

\*The 2005 figure is as of May 2005 and not a year end number.

There was no strategic plan at this college until 2004, it is too early to state firmly that any changes are a result of the college's strategic plan.

A review of the data shows that revenues of this type do not follow enrollment. At the end of FY 02 the H1B grant concluded. At the end of FY 04 MSC moved \$40K to the federal Title III grant at the college inflating University Generated Revenue in this area for this year. In early FY 05 the Title III grant concluded.

3. **Unit Level -- Recent Trends/Current Status**: What units in your college/campus account for the majority of the trend/current status? What units have been increasing/decreasing metric-wise and why?

The biggest changes can be identified as the H1B and Title II Grants.

4. **Environmental Conditions**: What recent and current environmental conditions, both within and outside your college/campus, have impacted outcomes reflected in this metric? Have such impacts been favorable or unfavorable, and why?

5. **Operating Assumptions:** What are the fundamental operating assumptions/ constraints that influenced your current planning relative to the outcome represented by this metric? What assumptions have been proven to be valid/invalid, and why?
6. **Recent Strategies/Impacts/Modifications:** Briefly, what are your recent planning strategies and their associated goals and objectives, actions taken, outcomes/impacts to date, etc.? What role has PBB played in your strategic planning process?

For a good deal of this data this is the first time we have had to study it in any meaningful and holistic manner. We still need time to make sense of this.

7. **Key Future Strategies/Action Plans:** Describe your current or expected near-term strategic plan(s) for reaching your 2009 metric targets; please include your estimated resource assumptions and processes for making annual benchmark comparisons and necessary mid-course adjustments. Are there a few well chosen actions that might result in a high payoff for this metric? If so, roughly estimate potential impacts. What strategic plans have you implemented in the near past that have/will yield high pay-offs?

Unknown at this time.

8. **Unintended Consequences:** Have recently implemented PBB strategies yielded unintended consequences, either beneficial or otherwise?
9. **Metric Gaps:** Are the metrics sufficient for your strategic planning? What additional metrics would be useful for your college? Are you already using other metrics for your strategic planning processes?

Much of the variation in this area comes from grants. This college does not have the capabilities to consistently write successful grants.

10. **Line of Sight to Department Level:** How have unit heads in your college/campus been involved in target setting and using PBB as a tool in your college/campus planning process? What are your near-term plans for a continued “Bottom-up” PBB implementation -- please include a list of possible difficulties and some estimate of resource needs. What advice/lessons learned have you heard from your counterparts at other institutions on implementing PBB practices? Internal to your college, are “programs” more appropriate than “departments” when considering a “Bottom-up” approach to PBB implementation?

None at this time.

11. **Additional Comments (Optional):** Please provide additional information you deem pertinent to PBB implementation @ UAA. You may find the “Possible Lines of Inquiry” list provided to you recently useful for this question.