



Academic Program Review

Program Name: Fisheries - Doctor of Philosophy

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 (Decrease in pass rates)

Response: While the decline in pass rates continued after the mid-cycle review, it is moderate and not statistically significant for graduate courses ($p=0.25$, 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 as noted below under achievement disparities.

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:

Based on assessments by the advisory committee, the SLOA goals were met for all outcomes, including written and oral communication, discourse, technical knowledge (subject-specific: & broader literature), logical thinking and analytical skills, and autonomy, as reflected in the following metrics (Goal is that 80% of students meet a given standard): 13 of 15 students successfully completed their degrees (87%); One student [REDACTED], another student lost good standing after [REDACTED] but failing to progress or engage thereafter.

- Competent or better written communication skills as evidences in the dissertation and publications (100%)
- Competent or better oral communication skills as evidenced in dissertation defense and presentations (100%)
- Competent or better ability to engage in scientific discourse as evidenced in logical thinking and ability to answer questions during defense (100%)
- Competent or better technical knowledge at the level of a fisheries professional, evidenced in successfully passing a comprehensive exam with 3 years of admission 12 of 15 or 80%), subject matter knowledge displayed in dissertation (100%), familiarity with relevant literature (100%)
- Competent or better logical thinking at the level of a fisheries professional, as evidenced in the dissertation defense (100%)
- Competent or better analytical ability at the level of a fisheries professional (100%)

Assessments by the Department Chair differed somewhat from those of the committee, in particular in the areas of written communication with 10 of 13 dissertations (77%) assessed as competent compared to a typical PhD level professional), and in the area of analytical ability (10 of 13 or 77% competent or better). The discrepancies between committee assessments and Chair assessments are difficult to reconcile, but may reflect the enormous breadth of dissertation topics encompassed in our Ph.D. program and differences in language and style among fields.

Writing deficiencies were also noted in the MS program and we are addressing these deficiencies as noted under Curricular Changes below.

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 written proposal to keep students on track and identify deficiencies early, as well as reducing time to completion, which has substantially increased in the Ph.D. program over the last 25 years.

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? **Yes**

If so, please summarize what changes were made.

Response:

The following changes were made to the SLOA plan for the PhD 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: Better distinguish the SLOA for the PhD program from the MS SLOA.

Response: Two specific outcomes were added under the broad categories of 'Communication' (1c. Discourse) and 'Problem Solving' (3c. Autonomy) to better reflect our expectation that PhD students engage at a more advanced level of discourse in their field and display better autonomy. The instrument used for assessing Discourse and Autonomy were already available in the rubric used by the advisory committees to assess logical thinking and ability to answer questions compared to a typical PhD level professional in the field. These implementation tools were previously underutilized (in particular 'ability to answer questions' was not used at all in the past).

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 Fisheries Ph.D. program uses multiple High-Impact Practices (HIPs) that promote advanced scholarship, autonomy, and professional expertise in alignment with the program's learning outcomes. Doctoral students engage in authentic research experiences that typically result in peer-reviewed publications and a dissertation demonstrating independent inquiry, which are key characteristics of HIPs that emphasize discovery and sustained project-based learning.

Outcomes related to communication, discourse, and autonomy are achieved through activities that require students to generate and defend original research, communicate findings to diverse audiences, and situate their work within broader scientific and management contexts. The expectation that students engage in high-level scholarly discourse with experts during committee meetings, oral comprehensive exams, and conference presentations exemplifies HIPs focused on mentorship, collaborative engagement, and integrative learning.

The program also supports collaborative research and cross-disciplinary training, as doctoral students are often co-investigators on projects with faculty across CFOS and other UA units, or work with partners in NOAA, ADF&G, and Tribal organizations. These collaborations enhance disciplinary breadth, global awareness, and professional networking, which are all key outcomes of HIPs.

Further, students participate in writing-intensive experiences (proposal, dissertation, and publications) and public dissemination through seminars, scientific meetings, and outreach to management agencies, reinforcing communication and civic engagement outcomes.

Overall, the Fisheries Ph.D. SLOA integrates HIPs that foster independence, analytical rigor, and leadership in applied fisheries science—ensuring graduates are not only competent researchers but also effective communicators, collaborators, and contributors to the sustainable stewardship of Alaska's and the world's aquatic resources.

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: No Change

Majors: No Change

Degrees Awarded: Decrease

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 proportion of students identifying as [REDACTED] decreased from 61.3% in FY21 and FY22 to 48.4% in FY25, while the proportions of [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] increased somewhat from a total of 19.4% in the first two years to 38.8% in FY25.

19.4% of students in FY25 identified as [REDACTED] compared to 15.7% of Alaska's population identifying as [REDACTED] in the 2020 census. This is likely due to an enrollment boost from [REDACTED], which specifically serves [REDACTED] students..

The number of [REDACTED] students in the program increased steadily and significantly ($p = 0.015$) from 0 in 2021 to 4 (13-14%) in FY24 and FY25. This is consistent with a similar but more pronounced increase in [REDACTED] students in the MS program. This increase may be linked to the increase in [REDACTED] students.

Achievement Disparities

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

Response:

Overall pass rates in graduate level courses 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 ($p = 0.013$).

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 [REDACTED] - include enhancing culturally responsive and place-based learning by further integrating [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] into coursework and research contexts, collaborating with [REDACTED] 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 Fisheries Ph.D. program integrates High-Impact Practices (HIPs) such as original research, publication, interdisciplinary collaboration, and professional communication, which are directly aligned with outcomes in communication, technical knowledge, problem solving, discourse, and autonomy. Doctoral students lead independent research resulting in peer-reviewed publications, present at professional conferences, and engage in cross-disciplinary collaborations with CFOS, other UAF units and external partners. These experiences reinforce autonomy and scholarly discourse at the highest level. Student success is reflected in strong completion rates, high post-graduation employment in fisheries and ecosystem science, and demonstration of professional-level writing, analytical, and communication skills in dissertation assessments.

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 Ph.D. program advances UAF's Land, Sea, and Space Grant mission by integrating research, teaching, and public service focused on the sustainability of Alaska's and the Arctic's aquatic resources. Students conduct original, place-based research that informs management and policy, often in collaboration with agencies, Tribal governments, and international partners. The program prepares graduates for leadership roles in research, education, and governance, fostering active citizenship and lifelong learning while strengthening UAF's role as a global leader in circumpolar science.

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

Response:

The Fisheries Ph.D. program is closely integrated with other academic and research programs across the University of Alaska system. Within the College of Fisheries and Ocean Science, 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, Biology and Wildlife Department, and other UAF units, 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 I 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 leading positions and careers in applied fisheries and aquatic sciences or management. Among █ recent alumni from the review period, █ have accepted federal positions with agencies such as █ and █, █ have joined an academic institution as a post-doc or researcher, █ each have joined state agencies and █, while █ graduate works for █ and another for an █. Thus all our recent graduates successfully transitioned 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:

fmueter@alaska.edu

Committee Review

Program Name: Fisheries - Doctor of Philosophy

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 identified some challenges in achievement gaps and provided possible solutions. Financial data were hard to interpret and not considered. Especially at the program level vs departmental level.

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:

Evaluation of objectives is too subjective and done only by a few people, i.e., committee and department chair

Scientific rigor as well as written and oral communication skills (especially at the PhD level) are best evaluated using external review practices, e.g., proposal success, manuscripts, conference participation. These things are generally expected at the PhD level, especially in the sciences, and most of it is already tracked by faculty as part of the AAR, so it should be easy to integrate into “instruments” to achieve goals. This could also serve to better differentiate scope of MS and PhD, e.g., 1 manuscript submitted versus 2 published etc.

Success in the job market is important to add to SLOA, also to better align with the mission to source the next generation of managers etc. I understand that this is difficult to track, but nonetheless critical to try

Student Success and Equity Feedback

Narrative:

Trends highlighted in the PhD program review accurately mirror data provided by the PAIR dashboard. Overall annual GIP rate for the review 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 significantly increase the pass rate among [REDACTED] students, which can also be utilized for all fisheries grad students that fail to pass graduate courses. Noted decrease in degrees awarded, program should address and make improvements on how to maintain or increase this metric.

High Impact Practices Feedback

Narrative:

The Fisheries Ph.D. program employs a number of HIPs and they are clearly described and explicitly linked to SLOAs. Graduate level research, generally in collaborations with researchers at other UAF units, at agencies, and/or other organizations can be expected to provides meaningful experiences in an applied context. Integration is not explicitly described but HIPs are centered around practices that support students in completing their dissertation project

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 - Doctor of Philosophy

Academic Year 2025/2026

Dean Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The Fisheries PhD is a cornerstone degree program of the Fisheries Department, as is the MS degree program, and benefits from collaboration with other CFOS department faculty, as well as with UAS 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 - Doctor of Philosophy

Academic Year 2025/2026

Vice Provost Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The program revised its SLOA following the 2023 mid-cycle review, resulting in a strong and well-structured set of learning outcomes that appropriately assess the knowledge, skills, and abilities of PhD graduates. The three SLOs include clear assessment procedures, implementation plans, and subcomponents, and the program provided rubrics and associated data, including independent evaluations by the department chair and committee. However, additional artifacts and assessment tools should be included in future reviews to fully document the evaluation process. The program's retrospective review of writing-related curricular elements, proposal defense, and time-to-completion was a helpful start, though additional narrative would strengthen the connection between assessment findings and curricular adjustments. For the 2027 mid-cycle program review, the program should continue to provide direct evidence demonstrating how SLOs are evaluated, document any new curricular changes and their impacts, and ensure clearer discussion of how SLO assessments link to broader program improvements.

The program reviewed PAIR dashboard trends, noting generally high pass rates, strong persistence, and an 85% completion rate for the review cohort. Enrollment and graduation rates increased, particularly for students in federal, state, and international programs. However, some declines were identified, including a decrease in pass rates for students, and the small cohort sizes make trend interpretation difficult. Disaggregated data showed that the narrative did not address emerging equity gaps or planned interventions for students experiencing lower outcomes. Proposed actions such as proactive advising and structural changes should be implemented and evaluated, and the program would benefit from more robust analysis of demographic trends, longer-term performance outcomes, and the impact of planned mentorship and cohort-building strategies.

High-impact practices are clearly embedded throughout the PhD program and closely aligned with the SLOA. Students engage in interdisciplinary research, community partnership development, communication and public engagement, and collaborative learning experiences that support both disciplinary expertise and broader professional skills. The program effectively integrates HIPs to support student learning and research success, demonstrating a strong connection between practice and outcomes. No further concerns were noted, and continuing to document how HIPs reinforce SLO achievement will support closing-the-loop expectations for the 2027 review.



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 program 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 graduate courses are cross-listed across CFOS programs—such as 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 Sciences	BS
Fisheries	MS
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 Liasion	
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 Liasion	
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 the third in the year 2025 (DKQ - 2025.10.16)**