



Academic Program Review

Program Name: Fisheries - Master of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Recent Recommendations

Using your most recent review, please respond to all feedback and recommendations.

Response:

Recommendation/Feedback: Fisheries MS and Fisheries PhD had identical reviews, very similar SLOA Plans.

Response: SLOAs for MS and Ph.D. were revised to better differentiate the outcomes, specifically by adding outcomes related to discourse and autonomy for the PhD that differentiate expectations for PhD students from those of MS students (see revised SLOAs).

Recommendation/Feedback: Address declines in student success metrics (Decline in degrees awarded, Decrease in pass rates, Equity gaps)

Response: The apparent declines in some metrics and equity gaps were re-examined. MS degrees awarded and pass rates in graduate courses have been variable, but did not show a statistically significant decline ($p=0.15$ and $p=0.25$, respectively). We are continuing to monitor these metrics, but without fully understanding the causes no curricular changes were made specific to these trends, but faculty continue to work on improving course content and structure, in particular for online teaching, to improve the student experience.

Recommendation/Feedback: Learning Outcomes "Requires Minor Revision". Several specific changes to SLOAs were recommended. Response: Changes are detailed in the next section.

Student Learning Outcomes

Describe the assessment of your student learning outcomes (SLOs). Discuss your findings, changes you are making, and what you hope to see as a result.

Response:

The SLOA goals were met for oral communication, technical knowledge (subject-specific & broader literature), logical thinking and analytical skills as reflected in the following metrics (Goal is that 80% of students meet a given standard):

Written proposal approved: 31 of 34 (91%) of students

Successful proposal defense within 2 years: 27 of 32 (84%)

Competent or better technical knowledge at the level of a fisheries professional, evidenced in successful proposal defense (94% pass rate) and assessments of subject matter and literature knowledge displayed in the written thesis by the committee and Department Chair (93-97%)

Competent or better logical thinking at the level of a fisheries professional, as assessed by the committee (93%) and the Department Chair (87%) Competent or better analytical ability at the level of a fisheries professional, as assessed by the committee (97%) and the Department Chair (84%)

The SLOA goal was not met for written communication with 23 of 30 students (77%) writing at the level of a competent fisheries professional as assessed by the Advisory Committee, missing the 80% goal. However, 27 of 31 students met the standard as assessed by the Department Chair. This suggests improvement in overall writing skills over the duration of the MS program, as reflected in the final written thesis.

Did you make any curricular changes based on your most recent SLOA? If so, discuss what changes were made. If no changes were made, please discuss the strengths of your curriculum based on the assessment of your outcomes.

Response:

To improve technical writing skills, we added a writing course specific to fisheries FISH F677 'Scientific Writing Techniques'; We also now recommend that applicants to the program submit one or two writing samples and we sponsored a writing group for students; We clarified the timeline to completion for students with improved guidance for the proposal defense to keep students on track and reduce time to completion, which may be one reason for the lower number of graduates in some recent years. However, an analysis of trends in time to completion and in the rate of students not finishing over the last 20 years found no significant trends (analysis available upon request).

As of 2017, all Baccalaureate programs are required to embed communication outcomes within their SLOA Plans. This is optional for non-Baccalaureate programs.

Communication outcomes in the SLOA plan are: [Embedded](#)

Check the checkbox to certify completion of the following tasks:

- ☒ Upload supporting documents to the Supporting Documents folder. This includes artifacts, rubrics, and other documents related to your SLOA.
- ☒ Upload your most recent SLOA to the Supporting Documents folder, even if no changes have been made since the last review.

Have changes been made to your SLOA document since your last review?

If so, please summarize what changes were made.

Response: [Yes](#)

The following changes were made to the SLOA plan for the MS in response to feedback from the mid-cycle review.

Recommendation: The recommendation from the review panel is to reduce the number of SLOs from 4 to 3 by eliminating SLO #4.

Response: SLO #4 (relating to post-graduation success) was removed from the SLOA. We continue to track employment and publication success of students post-graduation to assess overall program outcomes.

Recommendation: The program might consider revising the outcomes to include more "action" words. It is difficult to assess things like "understand" or "recognize." "Identify", "explain", or "analyze" are clearer outcomes to assess.

Response: Language in the SLOA plan describing the intended outcomes was updated to include more action words.

Recommendation: Include rubrics for assessment

Response: Rubrics for outcomes assessment are included in the Supporting Materials (Outcomes Assessment Defense Evaluation Form; Chair Review of thesis form)

High Impact Practices

Please indicate which high impact practices are currently being implemented in relation to the program's student learning outcomes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Capstone Courses & Projects | ☒ Graduate Level Research |
| ☒ Collaborative Assignments & Projects | ☒ Writing-Intensive Courses |
| ☒ Diversity/Global Learning | ☒ Publications |
| ☐ ePortfolios | ☒ Communications |
| ☐ First-Year Seminars and Experiences | ☐ Scholarly Activities |
| ☐ Internships | ☐ Studios |
| ☐ Service or Community-Based Learning | ☐ Practicum |
| ☐ Undergraduate Research | ☐ Other |
| ☒ Labs | ☐ None of these |

Discuss how the HIPs in the program are reflected in the SLOA. If you have identified HIPs that are not included in the SLOA, please consider an update.

Response:

The M.S. Fisheries program embeds a number of High Impact Practices (HIPs) in its learning outcomes and assessment framework, aligning experiential, collaborative, and research-intensive learning with professional competencies in fisheries science.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects are embedded in some of our core classes but, more importantly, are a central part of the required thesis and advisory committee process. Each student's project involves collaboration with faculty, agency scientists, and often interdisciplinary teams. The proposal and thesis defenses (both written and oral) directly assess students' ability to synthesize and communicate knowledge in a collaborative, professional context.

Graduate Research and Writing-Intensive Experiences are represented at the graduate level through the expectation that students design and execute an independent research project leading to a written thesis that meets professional publication standards. The SLOA emphasizes writing proficiency through explicit criteria for thesis and proposal quality relative to typical fisheries professionals, as reviewed by the advisory committee and department chair.

Diversity and Global Learning is embedded in the program's mission and vision, which highlight Alaska's diverse communities, Arctic and global contexts, and the management of renewable resources in culturally and geographically varied settings. Coursework and thesis topics often address cross-cultural, international, or Indigenous fisheries management issues, reflecting the program's global and inclusive perspective. These perspectives are also reflected in the variety of courses offered from "International Maritime Law and IUU Fishing" to "Indigenous Fisheries of Alaska".

Applied and Lab-based Learning occurs through courses such as Ichthyology, Quantitative Population Dynamics, Modern Applied Statistics for Fisheries, and human-dimensions courses that include field and analytical components. Assessment of technical competence in these areas as reflected in oral and written assignments, the proposal defense, and the written thesis ensures that experiential learning in laboratories and applied field settings is systematically evaluated.

Finally, the emphasis on oral and **written communication and professional presentations** at conferences reflects public communication HIPs, with outcomes measured through the proposal defense, thesis presentations, and the **production of publishable research**.

Student Success

Please reference the [Resources tab](#) for information on accessing the Student Success Data Dashboard and contacting your designated data liaisons.

Student Success Data Trends

Persistence: **No Change**

Pass Rates: **Decrease**

Student Credit Hours: **Increase**

Majors: **Increase**

Degrees Awarded: **No Change**

Other Trends (if applicable):

The overall pass rate in fisheries courses declined from 92% in 2021 to 82% in 2025, a statistically significant decline ($p = 0.041$). The decline was more pronounced for undergraduate courses (marginally significant, $p = 0.060$) than for graduate courses (not significant, $p = 0.245$) (see BA/BS program reviews)

The number of [REDACTED] students increased slightly over the review period from 0 in 2021/22 to 5 in 2025.

The number of [REDACTED] students in the program increased steadily and significantly ($p = 0.002$) from 2 (5%) in 2021 to 12 (26%) in 2025.

Achievement Disparities

Discuss any achievement disparities identified in your disaggregated student success data and explain how you plan to address them.

Response:

Pass rates were higher for [REDACTED] vs [REDACTED] students, but the number of [REDACTED] students was low.

Pass rates were also higher for [REDACTED] vs [REDACTED] students.

There were no significant differences in pass rates for graduate courses among racial groups ($p > 0.05$) but there was a notable and significant decrease in the pass rate of [REDACTED] students from 100% in the first two years to 82.4% in 2025 ($p = 0.013$), while pass rates in other groups declined less and non-significantly.

The program recognizes this as a critical equity issue and we are exploring several strategies to address underlying causes and strengthen support for all students. Some possibilities - building on the strengths of the Tamamta program - include enhancing culturally responsive and place-based learning by further integrating [REDACTED] fisheries and [REDACTED] stewardship systems into coursework and research contexts, collaborating with local and [REDACTED] experts as guest lecturers and mentors to re-inforce relevance of fisheries science to [REDACTED] improving mentorship structure (faculty, peer, community mentors), develop early-alert systems, further strengthen cohort-building, and reviewing assessment and grading practices to ensure transparency, consistency, and alignment with learning outcomes.

Closing the Loop

Please discuss how your student learning outcomes are reflected in high impact practices and student success data.

Response:

The program's student learning outcomes are tightly linked to high-impact educational practices that emphasize research, collaboration, and applied learning, which are some of the core elements of graduate education in fisheries. Outcomes related to written and oral communication, technical competence, and analytical problem-solving are directly assessed through high-impact practices such as thesis research, field and laboratory projects, and writing-intensive coursework. These activities promote mastery of disciplinary content while fostering independence, professional communication skills, and engagement with real-world resource management issues.

The student success data suggest that these practices are generally effective in supporting persistence and completion. Retention and persistence rates remained high (near 100% for most of the review period) and graduation numbers, while variable, did not exhibit a statistically significant decline. These trends indicate that once students engage in research and mentorship structures provided by the program, they are highly likely to complete their degrees.

The observed decline in overall course pass rates, particularly at the undergraduate level, underscores the importance of ongoing attention to instructional design and support mechanisms that sustain academic rigor while ensuring accessibility. Continued emphasis on active learning, culturally responsive instruction, and mentoring will help maintain alignment between high-impact practices and student success, ensuring that the program's learning outcomes continue to translate into measurable academic and professional achievement.

Academic Program Profile

The following questions help show how your program supports the university's mission, connects with other UA programs, engages with the community, contributes through service courses, and supports student success after graduation. Please use this section to highlight the value your program brings to students, the university, and beyond.

UAF's Mission:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks is a Land, Sea, and Space Grant university and an international center for research, education, and the arts, emphasizing the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples. UAF integrates teaching, research, and public service as it educates students for active citizenship and prepares them for lifelong learning and careers.

In what ways does your program advance UAF's mission?

Response:

The program advances UAF's Land, Sea, and Space Grant mission by integrating teaching, research, and public service focused on Alaska's and the Arctic's aquatic ecosystems. Through applied, place-based research and partnerships with state, federal, Tribal, and international organizations, the program prepares students for professional careers in fisheries and resource management. It fosters active citizenship, lifelong learning, and leadership among a diverse student body while generating knowledge essential to sustaining Alaska's fisheries and the communities that depend on them—thereby directly supporting UAF's role as a global center for circumpolar research and education.

How is your program related to others in the UA system?

Response:

The Fisheries M.S. program is closely integrated with other academic and research programs across the University of Alaska system. Within the College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, the program collaborates extensively with Marine Biology and Oceanography, sharing faculty expertise, facilities, and courses that span ecosystem processes from freshwater to marine systems. Faculty and students at our Juneau campus collaborate with faculty and students in the marine biology program at UAS. Juneau students also rely on a UAS statistics course to meet a program requirement and often serve as TAs for UAS courses. Fisheries faculty and students also engage in multidisciplinary research with researchers at the International Arctic Research Center (IARC), Water and Environmental Research Center, and Biology and Wildlife Department, linking climate, ecology, and human dimensions of resource management. The program contributes to and benefits from university-wide initiatives that emphasize Indigenous knowledge and governance, including the Tamamta program, which integrates Indigenous and Western approaches to stewardship of Alaska's waters. These collaborations enhance the program's scientific breadth, cultural relevance, and training opportunities, preparing graduates for leadership in fisheries and ecosystem management across Alaska and the circumpolar North.

Who are your key community or external partners?

Response:

The program maintains long-standing partnerships with agencies and organizations engaged in fisheries and ecosystem management, including the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service, and numerous Tribal governments and organizations across Alaska. Collaborations also extend to the regional fishery management council, nonprofit research institutions, and community organizations, providing students with applied research opportunities, professional mentoring, and direct engagement in policy-relevant science that benefits Alaska's communities and resources.

What role do your services courses play, if any?

Response:

Fisheries faculty provide a range of service courses that contribute broadly to graduate education and professional development across UAF. These include quantitative ecology and population dynamics courses and Marine Policy courses that serve students from other CFOS programs (e.g., Marine Biology, Oceanography) as well as from departments such as Biology and Wildlife, Mathematics and Statistics, or from policy-focused programs. Several of the quantitative Fisheries courses can meet requirements for the State of Alaska Biometrician Register, thereby attracting students aiming to qualify for the register. Many of our courses also attract agency researchers and professionals seeking training in fisheries management, marine policy, Indigenous fisheries, or advanced quantitative and analytical training relevant to fisheries and ecosystem management. These service offerings strengthen interdisciplinary collaboration within the UA system, expand the reach and impact of CFOS instruction, and help maintain consistent standards of analytical rigor and applied problem-solving across related scientific disciplines.

How do your graduates succeed after leaving the program?

Response:

Graduates have an excellent record of professional success, reflecting strong preparation for applied and research careers in fisheries and aquatic sciences or management. Among 31 recent alumni from the review period, [REDACTED] have accepted federal positions with agencies such as NOAA, USGS, and Sea Grant, and [REDACTED] have joined state agencies, primarily the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Others have pursued consulting careers [REDACTED], doctoral studies [REDACTED], or academic and technical positions [REDACTED]. One graduate now works for [REDACTED]. Only a small number [REDACTED] are employed outside the field, demonstrating that most graduates transition effectively into fisheries-related professions that align closely with the program's mission and learning outcomes.

Submitter and Collaborator Names:

Franz Mueter, Christina Sutton, Gabrielle Hazelton, Andres Lopez, Curry Cunningham, Jeff Muehlbauer

Submitter Email:

ffmueter@alaska.edu

Committee Review

Program Name: Fisheries – Master of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Overall Recommendations

The college or school committees set the tone for helping each program feel seen during this process. We have provided you with feedback tags to attach to this program review. Please select as many as applicable.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Insufficient Narratives | ☐ Report Incomplete |
| ☐ Address Achievement Gap | ☐ Consider Curricular Revisions |
| ☐ Develop Online Offerings/Options | ☐ Improve Time to Degree |
| ☐ Increase Enrollment | ☐ Increase Graduates |
| ☐ Increase Retention/Persistence | ☒ Strengthen Advising Practices |
| ☐ May be asked to share Effective Practices | ☐ Recommendation to University-Wide Committee |

Explanation of Overall Recommendations

Response:

The program has many strengths, operates at low cost, and is actively working to address a few weak metrics such as the SLOA goal for written communication. The program has recently revised their SLOAs resulting in positive change. The program HIPs are strong, but have some room for improvement including better alignment with the SLOAs. Within the SLOAs there are still a few wording issues that should be addressed including differences between written and oral communication goals. Additionally, we found the evaluation of the SLOs to be somewhat subjective and unclear. The program identified a decline in overall course pass rates and they suggest some possible mechanisms to address these issues. They do not however discuss how or when the implementation of these mechanisms will occur. There is clear evidence of graduate success in the form of alumni job acquisition and on-going agency collaboration that further highlights the program's strengths.

Student Learning Outcomes Feedback

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Strong | ☐ Developing |
| ☒ Requires Minor Revision | ☐ Requires Major Revision |

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Strong Alignment with SLOA Plan | ☐ Clear, Concise Presentation of Findings |
| ☐ Compelling Learning Story | ☐ Missing a Direct Measure |
| ☒ Missing Active Verbs | ☐ Missing Curricular Connection |
| ☐ Missing Collaboration within Department | |

SLOA Feedback Narrative:

The SLOs are generally aligned with the CFOS goal of producing competent students that are experts in Alaska's fisheries. However, the SLO would benefit from some rewording. The intended objectives/ outcomes are written in a way that may cause some confusion. The phrasing "Students should be able" is used frequently. This should be changed to more assertive language (e.g., "Students will..."). See suggestions for individual SLOs and SLOAs below.

1 Communication

1a. Written: It is difficult to say how "clear logic, language, and convincing arguments" will be evaluated or measured. Using clear language and arguments that are well supported by academic literature may be a better approach.

1b. Oral: Other than the "should be" wording, this objective is measurable in a pass/ fail context.

2. Technical Knowledge: Other than the "should be" wording, this objective is measurable.

3. Problem Solving

3a. Logical Thinking: The use of the term "logical" is a bit out of place here. The actual objective is focused on the student's ability to critically evaluate and synthesize literature, and to demonstrate that ability by defending their thesis not on the use of logic.

3b. Analytical: This SLO is appropriate.

SLOAs

We suggest going through and ensuring that the SLOA instruments and the Min. Standards align. For instance, in area 2 "thesis" is listed as an instrument, but it is not listed in the Min. Standard. This is the same for objective 3.

Communication - the assessment of completing the proposal within two years is only listed for the Oral proposal. Should this be included for the written as well? The language differs between Oral and Written. For example, the written work is to be "at the level of a competent MS level fisheries professional." The oral is "will present thesis at the level of a competent fisheries professional." This should be standardized.

The instruments and Min. Standards do not align. This could be fixed easily by a slight rewording. As the SLOA is currently written it is unclear if the advisory committees make decisions (fill out the rubrics) collectively or individually? This should be clarified.

Student Success and Equity Feedback

Narrative:

Reported trends/data accurately reflect information provided by PAIR dashboard. Incremental increase from 0% to 20% in first-generation MS Fisheries students awarded degrees. GIP rate over the evaluation period was high~97%. As noted, the pass rate by [REDACTED] graduate students dropped over the last two years during the eval period. Specific suggestions to improve made by the program include faculty/peer/community support structure and an early alert system for students lagging academically. Further improvements may include the implementation of a step wise, strategic pathway to bridge the gap in pass rate among [REDACTED] students.

High Impact Practices Feedback

Narrative:

HIPs are very thoroughly described with fairly clear linkages to the SLOAs but with some room for improvement. The SLOAs could be modified to make it more clear how they relate to the HIPs for example listing the courses that fulfill the writing intensive course and how it relates to the SLOA on written communication. Another linkage between the SLOA on technical knowledge and the human dimensions courses mentioned in the HIP under the category of 'Diversity and Global Learning' could be made more clear in the SLOA document as well. Overall it is clear from this section how students are engaging in meaningful practices. The HIPs are fairly well integrated into the program while still allowing for flexibility in course selection.

Profile Feedback

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Mission-Centric to College and/or UAF | ☒ Unique within UA |
| ☒ Collaborative with other UA Programs | ☐ Provides Job Placement for Graduates |
| ☒ Strong Post-Grad Success for Students | ☒ Strong Service Teaching Component |
| ☒ Strong Ties to Community or Industry | |

Financial Feedback

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ High Tuition Revenues | ☒ High Grant Revenues |
| ☐ Operates at Low Cost | ☒ Productive Faculty |
| ☐ Opportunities to Increase Revenue | ☐ Low Enrollment |

Reviewer Names:

Cramb, Hennon, Horstmann, Hueffer, Kelley, Mueter

Dean Review
Program Name: Fisheries – Master of Science
Academic Year 2025/2026

Dean Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The Fisheries MS is a cornerstone degree program of the Fisheries Department, as is the PhD degree program, and benefits from collaboration with other CFOS department faculty. Prior minor issues with SLOAs, HIPs are being addressed. The program is very important to meeting Alaska's workforce needs in fisheries.

Recommendation to University-Wide Committee

No

Vice Provost Review
Program Name: Fisheries – Master of Science
Academic Year 2025/2026

Vice Provost Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The program followed the guidance from the 2023 mid-cycle review and produced a strong, well-revised SLOA, including clearly differentiated SLOs for the MS and PhD programs. All three SLOs include well-defined assessment procedures and implementation plans, and the program provided the relevant rubric and associated data. The dual-review approach—department chair and committee members conducting independent assessments and reconciling discrepancies—demonstrated thoughtful attention to process. The retrospective analysis of writing-related curricular elements, proposal defense, and time-to-completion was a good start, though additional narrative would strengthen the connection between findings and curricular decisions. For the 2027 mid-cycle review, the program should continue to include direct evidence (data) and any additional artifacts/rubrics, and further articulate how curricular changes are informed by assessment results and aligned with the revised SLOA. The three

The program reviewed PAIR data and used statistical analysis to evaluate persistence, pass rates, majors, credit hours, and degrees awarded, demonstrating a data-informed approach. Persistence remained stable, while pass rates declined from 92% in 2021 to 82% in 2025, and [REDACTED] pass rates decreased notably, indicating an equity gap. [REDACTED] participation [REDACTED] % to 26%. The program's proposed actions—enhanced mentorship, early-alert systems, cohort-building, and integration of [REDACTED] experts—are appropriate next steps. Continued attention to equity gaps, especially for [REDACTED] students, will be important as the program works to align SLOs and assessment practices to support student success.

No further comments on High-Impact Practices beyond the committee's narrative; future reviews should continue to document the relationship between HIPs and specific SLOs as part of closing-the-loop expectations.



Department Profile and Financial Data

Department Name: Fisheries

Last updated: 2025/2026

Department Profile and Financial Data

This section aligns with Board of Regents Policy 10.06 and supports systemwide consistency in academic program review. Responses are maintained across review cycles and may not need to be updated annually. Please review your previous answers and update only if necessary.

When answering the following questions, refer exclusively to the standardized Financial Data Template provided by UAF. Work with your data liaison to interpret the template accurately. Do not include any additional or alternative data — consistency across programs is essential. To maintain integrity and standardization across all of UAF it is very important that you do not provide any additional or alternative data from this template.

Confirmation of Review

Have you reviewed the information in this section and made any necessary updates? ☒ Yes

Financial Data Spreadsheet

☒ I have reviewed the Financial Template for updates and accuracy.

Cost Effectiveness

Please describe strategies such as instructional efficiency, shared resources, cross-listed courses, or other ways your department uses resources thoughtfully.
Response:

The Fisheries Department maximizes instructional efficiency and resource use through extensive collaboration within the College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (CFOS) and across UAF. The department shares classrooms, laboratories, and instructional technology with Oceanography and Marine Biology, facilitating interdisciplinary teaching and efficient use of facilities. Numerous undergraduate and graduate courses are cross-listed across CFOS and other UAF programs—such as *Fact or Fishin*, *The Harvest of the Sea*, *Ichthyology*, *Fisheries Oceanography*, *Modern Applied Statistics for Fisheries*, *Statistical Computing with R*, *Data Analysis in Community Ecology*, *Political Ecology*, *Aquatic Food Web Ecology*, and *Scientific Writing Techniques*—allowing students from multiple disciplines to benefit from shared expertise. Many courses are also stacked at the undergraduate and graduate levels (e.g., *FISH 411/611*, *412/613*, *426/626*, *428/628*, *433/633*, *435/635*, *425/625*, *451/651*, *476/676*), promoting teaching efficiency and mentoring across academic levels. The program further shares staff and academic coordinators with other CFOS units, ensuring that limited resources are deployed strategically to support high-quality, interdisciplinary instruction and research training.

Associated Programs

Program Name	Degree Type
Fisheries	BA
Fisheries and Marine Science	BS
Fisheries	PhD
Marine Policy	MMP

Collaborator Name(s):
Franz Mueter

Collaborator Email(s):
fmueter@alaska.edu



Financial Data

Department Name: Fisheries

Academic Year 2025/2026

	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	For Data Entry Staff	For Programs and Review Committees
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	1220	1481	1748	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.	
Service SCH	248	260	385	Sum rows labeled as "In unit, outside department, Service" and "Outside unit, Service" in the SCH tab of the data provided by PAIR.	
Department FTEs	24.205	21.1	25.1625	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Total SCH per Department FTE	50.40	70.19	69.47		
Service SCH per Department FTE	10.25	12.32	15.30		
Majors in Programs	165	209	268	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.	
Department FTE's	24.205	21.1	25.1625	This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Majors per Department FTE	6.82	9.91	10.65		

Total Unrestricted Expenditures				Total Expenditures made from budgets with an F1 or F7 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liaison	
Total Restricted Expenditures				Total Expenditures made from budgets with revenue of the F2 or S2 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liaison	
Total Unit/Central Support Allocated to Program(s)				Expenses incurred for direct support of instruction within orgs identified as central or academic support, if applicable	
Total Expenditures					

Tuition Revenue				Receipts to college from tuition generated by the department/program (F1). NOTE: under the current 80/20 percent tuition distribution model generating units receive 80%. PLEASE USE PAIR REPORTED SCH.	Receipts to college from tuition generated by the department/program, based on the campus's active tuition distribution model, which determines how much the unit receives of their generated tuition, and how much the campus keeps (in addition to the out-of-state surcharges) to support central offices/functions. The current distribution model is 80/20, where the unit/college receives 80% of their generated in-state tuition.
State Appropriation Revenue				Appropriations for current funds operation of the university from the general fund of the State of Alaska through the annual budget cycle. This category also includes TVEP and State Mental Health Trust funds, if allocated to the department. (F1)	Appropriations for current funds operation of the university from the general fund of the State of Alaska through the annual budget cycle.
Restricted/Sponsored Project Revenue				Revenue from external sponsors; includes grants, contracts, sponsored projects & restricted (grant) accounts funded by UA Foundation funds (F2/S2)	Revenue from external sponsors; includes grants, contracts, sponsored projects & restricted (grant) accounts funded by UA Foundation funds
Fees				Course Fees (9159)	
Other UA Receipts/Revenue				e.g. Performance and Sales Receipts, Space Rental Revenue, Indirect Cost Recovery (F1/F7); NOTE: COURSE FEES (9159) REPORTED ABOVE	
Total Revenue					

Workload Allocation	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Teaching Units	159.67	172.75	193	Department faculty's workload units assigned to teaching
Service Units	51.5	44.75	45.55	Department faculty's workload units assigned to service
Research Units	141.83	138.5	128.75	Department faculty's workload units assigned to research

Full-Time Equivalent Worksheet*	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Faculty FTEs	10.35	9.1	9.35	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort assigned. F9 faculty on sabbatical count as 67% of one 9-month 0.75 FTE (or 0.50 FTE).
Adjunct FTEs				Base assumption: 40 units/credits = 1.0 FTE. Total # of credits taught by adjuncts in a year divided by 40 = the FTE of adjuncts in that year.
Staff FTEs	8.23	7.125	10.1875	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort.
Graduate TA/RA FTEs	5.625	4.875	5.625	Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.
Total Department FTEs	24.205	21.1	25.1625	Sum of all employee FTEs

*Note: FTE definitions and calculations for the purpose of Academic Program Review are different than for other institutional reporting processes (e.g. OMB or IPEDS reporting)

Information last updated by: luke canady

Date: october 3rd in the year 2025 (DKQ - 2025.10.16)