



Academic Program Review

Program Name: Fisheries and Marine Science – Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Recent Recommendations

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

Response:

The Fisheries and Marine Sciences (FMS) BS is delivered as a joint effort by the Fisheries, Marine Biology and Oceanography departments. Input from contributing faculty is incorporated into this response.

From the midterm review summary:

"Many of the comments for the Fisheries and Marine Sciences BS and Fisheries BA are the same because, outside of the student success data, the program reviews were nearly identical. SLOA plans are very similar or identical for the undergraduate programs (3 out of 4 SLOs were identical). It is essential that different programs have different outcomes"

"The recommendation from the review panel is to reduce the number of SLOs from 4 to 3 by eliminating SLO #4. The program is encouraged to retain this measure of outcome assessment (#4) for their own internal tracking purposes (just not use it as part of program review)."

"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."

A major recommendation from the midcycle review was to differentiate the SLO between the BA and BS to better represent the intended outcomes for each program, and to revise the SLO in terms of numbers and action words. See below for specific changes.

Recommendations about HIP from the midterm review:

The review panel recommends including examples to demonstrate/highlight each HIP. For example, what are examples of capstone course projects?

What percentage of students participate in each HIP for those that are optional?

This has been done in the HIP section

Recommendations about Student Success Metrics from the midterm review:

The review panel feels that it would be beneficial to see how the program intends to address any declines in student success metrics, specifically for those demographics with lower pass rates (women, AKN, and first-gen students).

The BS in FMS program has experienced significant growth in the past years as the program extended availability of asynchronous courses and provided a pathway for students to complete the degree fully online. In general, student underpreparedness can contribute to declines in student success metrics. We have taken a closer look at and updated listed course prerequisites to ensure students have the necessary preparation for any given course. Because unpreparedness in math skills can present challenges for students, we have included minimum math requirements that "exploratory" students must meet before they can declare the BS in FMS as their major. Additionally, we are aware that loopholes for meeting entrance criteria into a UAF bachelor's degree programs can result in underprepared students being allowed into STEM majors. These loopholes are present for students entering the university not directly from high school. Our full-time undergraduate advisor (██████████) is working closely with incoming students to identify and counsel students with unofficial deficiencies. He is knowledgeable of the curriculum and advises students for the best pathways for a timely graduation that include paying attention to prerequisites. We see personalized advising for our majors and manageable class sizes being essential components to prevent declines in student success metrics.

See Student Success 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:

During the midterm review our assessment of SLOs applicable to graduates from 2021-2023 were as follows:

"In terms of the four academic skills (writing ability, verbal communication, critical thinking and core knowledge) students showed improvement as determined from the difference between the introductory FISH 110 course evaluation and the capstone evaluation. Based on a scale from 1 (deficient) to 3 (strong), average cohort scores showed some improvement in writing (1.9 to 2.2), oral communication (2.2 to 2.4), critical thinking (2.1 to 2.3), and greater improvement in core knowledge (1.7 to 2.4). Students also showed improvement in these categories as collectively determined by the faculty who taught early (100-200 level) and late (300-400 level) courses. Here the distinction was generally more pronounced. writing (1.8 to 2.3), oral communication (1.8 to 2.3), critical thinking (2.1 to 2.5), and also improvement in core knowledge (2.0 to 2.4).

In terms of employment skills through experiential learning, all students were rated ≥ 3 on a 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) scale. The average cohort scores in the 13 categories ranged from 4.4 to 4.9, and the overall score for the cohort was 4.7. Graduates are very satisfied (4) or satisfied (1) with the program and feel prepared to join the workforce or graduate programs."

After the mid-cycle review, SLOs and the SLOA Plan were modified to address the recommendations. Using the new SLOs, the following assessment is applicable to graduates since the mid-term review. The scores discussed below were determined from the collective assessment of faculty teaching lower division (100-200 level) courses to assess the "before" score vs. the collective assessment from upper division (300-400 level) courses for the "after" score. Scores were based on a scale from 1 (deficient) to 3 (strong) compared to expectations for incoming graduate students and/or entry BS-level jobs in the field. Updated SLO #1 is related to communication and thinking skills, including oral and written communication, scientific reasoning, critical thinking, problem solving, and cross-cultural thinking. For SLO #1, average cohort scores showed improvements in oral and written communication (from 2.02 to 2.35); in scientific reasoning, critical thinking and problem solving (from 1.96 to 2.30); in cross-cultural thinking (from 1.66 to 2.36). The greatest improvement for this SLO was in cross-cultural thinking. This is likely because incoming students have had little exposure to consideration of cross-cultural issues prior to entering our program. Updated SLO #2 is related to core knowledge and its application to current issues. For SLO #2, average cohort scores also showed improvements in core knowledge (from 1.87 to 2.40) and its application (from 1.89 to 2.44). Updated SLO #3 is related to transferable skills. SLO #3 was assessed by supervisors/mentors of experiential learning courses and thesis work using the supervisor/mentor assessment form. The average cohort scores in the 13 categories ranged from 4.68 to 5.00, with an overall score of 4.84. Lower scores in the earlier (2021-2023 graduates) cohort could be due to individual differences in the members of each cohort. We have always made an effort to ensure partnerships with appropriate opportunities for the required undergraduate experiential learning.

NOTE: We have come to the realization that the increased enrollment will necessitate a different process for assessing the larger population of students, as our current practice is not time-efficient for the increased number of students. We created a committee in Fall of 2025 comprised of faculty in the three departments and the undergraduate advisor tasked to develop a better process for assessing SLOs and to address future curriculum needs for the program.

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:

A capstone course for the marine biology concentration was added in Spring of 2021. This course contributes to SLOs 1 and 2. Other curricular changes were made to provide greater breadth of courses (FISH F320, MBI F410, OCN F433 and OCN F459), or reflect a change due to new faculty updating the course (e.g., OCN F315, OCN F419).

Asynchronous modalities were added for core courses (e.g., OCN211 and MBI 212)

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 SLOs and assessment plans between for the BS program were differentiated from those of the BA. In addition, we have reduced the number of SLOs and revised verbs as suggested. The updated SLOs are as follows

1. Enhance skills in scientific reasoning, critical and cross-cultural thinking, problem-solving, and oral and written communication
2. Demonstrate core knowledge in fishery science, and/or marine sciences (i.e., marine biology or oceanography), and demonstrate ability to identify and analyze current issues in Alaska waters and beyond.
3. Acquire and improve transferable skills through coursework, experiential learning, and mentorship

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

☒ Collaborative Assignments & Projects

☒ Diversity/Global Learning

☐ ePortfolios

☒ First-Year Seminars and Experiences

☐ Internships

☐ Service or Community-Based Learning

☒ Undergraduate Research

☐ Labs

☐ Graduate Level Research

☒ Writing-Intensive Courses

☐ Publications

☒ Communications

☐ Scholarly Activities

☐ Studios

☒ Practicum

☒ Other

☐ 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 SLOA plan for the BS in FMS includes assessment of thinking and communication skills, core knowledge and its application to current issues, as well as assessment of practical transferable skills. The high impact practices selected above contribute to the assessment of the development/improvement of SLOs. For example, First-year seminars and experiences provide a baseline for the skills and knowledge being assessed at the end of the program. Writing-intensive courses, thesis writing, communication activities such as class presentations and experiential learning presentations allow assessment of oral and written communication skills. Capstone courses and projects and/or undergraduate research allow assessment of scientific reasoning, problem solving, critical thinking, and core knowledge and its application to current issues. Diversity and global learning, in particular Indigenous perspectives and international fisheries topics, are included throughout the curriculum and provide a mechanism to assess cross-cultural thinking. Practica during field courses and the experiential learning course along with undergraduate research allow assessment of the acquisition and improvement of transferable skills. Lastly, although not directly related to SLOs, we consider ensures students stay on track

All students in the program are involved in the selected high impact practices. Cohort building first-year courses are required for all students (FISH/MBI/OCN F102, FISH/MBI, OCN F103, FISH F110). A writing intensive course (OCN 303) is part of the degree requirements. Collaborative assignments, oral communication, and diversity/global learning are part of core courses and many electives. Experiential learning (practicum and/or undergraduate research) and communication of the experience is required for all students (FISH F390). However, students in their final year can opt to do a capstone class/project or to complete a senior thesis (undergraduate research).

An example of the type of work required in a capstone course/project: MBI F482: The capstone project examines anthropogenic impacts on the marine environment or potential solutions. Students synthesize information from peer-reviewed literature into a research paper, exploring a specific topic and its implications. The research project culminates in a class presentation, simulating presenting at a scientific conference or agency meeting. The capstone promotes learning outcomes related to oral and written science communication, scientific reasoning, critical thinking and problem solving. The capstone also promotes learning outcomes related to student's ability to identify and analyze issues in Alaska waters and beyond.

An example of the type of work required in a thesis project for all the concentrations: Student participation in fieldwork to collect samples, processing of samples in the field or back in the lab, analysis of sample data in context with related environmental variables and peer-reviewed literature. The thesis is a written document (15-20 pages) that includes the following sections: Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Acknowledgements and References. Tables, Figures and statistical analyses are embedded into the different sections. The thesis promotes learning outcomes related to written science communication, scientific reasoning, critical thinking and problem solving. The thesis also promotes learning outcomes related to student's ability to identify and analyze issues in Alaska waters and beyond and to acquire and improve transferable skills.

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: **Decrease**

Pass Rates: **No change**

Student Credit Hours: **Increase**

Majors: **Increase**

Degrees Awarded: **No Change**

Other Trends (if applicable):

Background for challenges in interpreting student success trends. The BS in FMS is delivered jointly by the Fisheries, Marine Biology and Oceanography departments. Before current course designators for Marine Biology (MBI) and Oceanography (OCN) courses existed, there was a single designator for courses taught by these 2 departments (MSL). Data for these courses are only included in Marine Biology. These undergraduate data includes the highly-subscribed GER course, MSL F111X "The Oceans" (now offered as OCN F111X), which is not part of the BS in FMS curriculum and is offered 3x per year. Additionally, undergraduate data in Fisheries also includes data for BA students.

Majors: Students in the major increased from 61 students in 2021 to 152 students in 2025. The increase is the result of asynchronous, on-line course development and a pathway to complete the degree fully on-line.

Degrees Awarded: Fluctuations from 3-9 were observed during the review period. We expect these will increase in future years as the influx of students that began in 2023 get through the program.

Pass rates. The average undergraduate course pass rate has remain fairly consistent (~80%), with a decrease to below 75% in 2022, which may reflect Pandemic ripple effects.

Persistence decreased slightly from an average of ~84% during the first three review years to an average of ~78.5% during the last two years. This could reflect the change in student population during the last two years, which includes students who are exclusively online, many of whom are [REDACTED] and holding full-time jobs while attempting to complete a degree.

Student credit hours: In combination FISH, OCN, MBI student credit hours have been increasing for lower and upper division courses since 2024. This reflecting the influx of majors. The decrease in MSL SCH reflects the phasing out of that course designator.

Achievement Disparities

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

Response:

Disaggregated student data for the BS in FMS indicate a consistent distribution of ~1/3 [redacted] to 2/3 [redacted] in the major throughout the review period. Similarly, there is a consistent distribution of ~1/3 [redacted] students to ~2/3 not [redacted] students. The increase in student enrollment from outside Alaska over the past two years, has resulted in a decrease in the % of students who are [redacted], an increase in the percent of students [redacted], and an increase in students taking advantage of [redacted]. The population of [redacted] students has held steady at ~10%. Approximately 3/4 of our student body are [redacted], with [redacted] students being the next largest population. While [redacted] and [redacted] students individually make up less than 5% of students in the BS.

The disaggregated undergraduate pass rate can't be further disaggregated by major, so the trends here include undergraduate students not in the BS. For all departments (as the BS is a joint effort), pass disparities for [redacted] students, [redacted] students, [redacted] students, and [redacted] students have decreased in the last year of data. Ensuring students have the necessary preparation for any given course, has helped address disparities in course pass rate. This is done through careful prerequisite choices and personalized advising. Additionally, having manageable size classes allows instructors to address disparities in learning as needed.

Persistence data is disaggregated by major. Disparities in this metric for students [redacted] and [redacted] students is apparent. Disparities based on [redacted] are harder to assess, as these populations are small and there is considerable fluctuation year to year. CFOS now employs an undergraduate advisor who helps CFOS undergraduate students stay on track for graduation by helping them choose appropriate courses each semester. Reduction in these disparities reflects our allocation of resources to support this position.

Closing the Loop

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

Response: The selected high-impact practices are strongly linked to the program's SLOs, which emphasize skills in communication and reasoning, application of core knowledge and of transferable practical skills. Mastering these is essential for continuing into graduate education or to join the workforce in fisheries and marine sciences. First-year seminars and experiences are incorporated into the program to build cohorts and to provide the baseline for the skills and knowledge assessed at the end of the program. Outcomes related to communication (written and oral), scientific reasoning, critical thinking and problem solving are directly assessed through high-impact practices such as writing-intensive coursework and thesis development, oral communication assignments, capstone projects and other collaborative assignments. Incorporating diversity/global learning in all courses promotes cross-cultural thinking. The inclusion of practica through field courses, and experiential learning opportunities fosters acquisition and improvement of transferable practical skills. All these activities contribute to the mastery of core knowledge while promoting application of knowledge to real-world current issues.

The student success data suggest that these practices are generally effective in supporting pass rate, and overall persistence, but as our student population increases and demographics change, future needs and challenges are also likely to change. For example, the observed decrease in persistence for first generation and for older students in recent years will need to be addressed to ensure degree completion.

Correct interpretation of student success data for this jointly delivered program, along with continued assessment of high impact practices will ensure the program's learning outcomes continue to translate into measurable achievement for our graduates.

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:

In general, CFOS 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 to continue their education in graduate school or for entry-level professional careers in fisheries and marine science. The BS in FMS fosters active citizenship, lifelong learning, and leadership among a growing student body while transferring knowledge essential to sustaining Alaska's aquatic resources and the communities that depend on them—thereby directly supporting UAF's role as a global center for circumpolar research and education. Individuals prepared with a degree in Fisheries and Marine Science contribute to the scientific workforce that will advance knowledge to better manage aquatic and marine resources not only in Alaska, but the rest of the nation.

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

Response:

This program is delivered by faculty within the three departments at CFOS (Fisheries, Marine Biology and Oceanography). In addition to providing 100-400 level courses, many of the graduate courses offered by these departments are stacked (400/600 level) courses that contribute to optional concentration requirements. As such, the BS in FMS is related to all other programs in CFOS. The program is also related to the many other colleges within UAF that deliver UAF's General Education Requirements and BS Degree Requirements, as CFOS relies on these units for these credits (50-55 credits out of 121 needed credits needed for graduation). Some of the STEM courses required for Program Requirements are BIOL, PHYS, and STAT courses. This program is also related to the UAS BS in Fisheries and Ocean Sciences: Fishes Science. Distance delivery of our FISH courses allow students to complete their coursework at UAS. In addition, our BS in FMS is related to the AAS degree and certificates in Applied Fisheries at UAS (Juneau and Sitka campuses), for which course transfer crosswalks into our BS have been developed or are currently being developed.

Who are your key community or external partners?

Response:

The experiential learning requirement for this degree necessitates interaction with state (ADF&G) and federal agencies (NOAA, NPS, USFWS, USGS), Alaska Native organizations, organizations offering undergraduate research experiences, and environmental and commercial entities in order to provide appropriate and meaningful experiential learning opportunities outside of UAF.

What role do your services courses play, if any?

Response:

OCN FI 11X (The Oceans) is a 4-credit GER course that offers honors credit. It contributes a science course for UAF's general education requirement and to the Honor's College

How do your graduates succeed after leaving the program?

Response:

CFOS Academic Programs Office sends exit interviews to our graduates, and in collaboration with faculty mentors, we keep track of the employment of recent graduates whenever possible. For the review period graduates (31) have enrolled in graduate school (6), have obtained entry-level employment at federal and state agencies, universities, and Native enterprises (20), or have gone on to work at hatcheries or fish commercially (2). One student is tending bar locally while they consider next steps in their career, and we do not have information for 2 graduates. This data suggest that 90% of our graduates successfully continue to be engaged in related activities upon graduation.

Submitter and Collaborator Names:

Ana Aguilar-Islas, Franz Mueter, Christina Sutton, Peter Westley, Amanda Kelley

Submitter Email:

amaguilarisla@alaska.edu

Committee Review

Program Name: Fisheries and Marine Science - Bachelor 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:

Successful program with strong connection to UA mission and Alaska job market. Financial data are difficult to tease apart in this program as three departments contribute to varying degrees. SLO could be strengthened by discussing how "enhancement" and "student progress" are evaluated beyond individual faculty assessments from classes. Some equity gaps have lessened and some are still apparent; strategies to address the gap are likely no sufficient, especially in the long-term. HIP narrative could be more clear.

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:

"Assessment" and "evaluation" do not necessarily show "enhancement" as stated in objectives. Reword objectives to reflect "criteria" and "implementation".

How is student "progress" evaluated? Different courses and faculty teaching them have different perspectives. This is a bit like comparing apples and oranges. How many faculty are making

these progress assessments? Is this actually happening and is the pool of evaluating faculty large and objective enough? What are "entry-level professional" standards? For example, internships can be completed with a variety of different entities. Are university-lab technician standards aligned with agency standards?

The objectives for #2 "core knowledge" should somewhere reflect the different available concentrations.

Student Success and Equity Feedback

Narrative:

The data are not possible for us to disaggregate by program, but in the program narrative they describe how pass disparities have lessened for [REDACTED] students, [REDACTED] students, [REDACTED] students in the last year, which is evidence of improved retention and inclusive practices. There are still equity gaps apparent in persistence of students [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] students. The strategies identified in the program review include personalized advising and small class sizes. They have hired an advisor to help in personalized advising, but it's likely that small class sizes will not be sustainable as the program grows, making this strategy less useful for the program in the long-term.

High Impact Practices Feedback

Narrative:

HIP section does provide some examples of capstone projects, and other HIPs, but doesn't very clearly lay out each of the categories for which boxes are checked. It does appear in the SLOA plan as evidence of meeting the outcomes such as doing a capstone project or thesis, completing a field course. There seem to be some HIPs that the program includes that are not currently checked such as 'labs'. Labs are required for some of the 200 level courses and also in most field courses and could be listed in the HIPs.

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 and Marine Sciences - Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Dean Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

I concur with the review that the BS-FMS has undergone a significant increase in enrollment over the past the past several years (ie more than doubled), significant increase in asynchronous course modality, and serves fisheries workforce needs in Alaska and beyond, and is offered jointly with UAS, another mark of successful collaboration. The program is delivered by all CFOS departments, making it tricky to disentangle "each departmental revenue" (revenue has doubled overall in recent years), but suffice to say it is highly collaborative and increasingly well enrolled. In short, this program is more successful than ever.

Recommendation to University-Wide Committee **No**

Vice Provost Review

Program Name: Fisheries and Marine Science - Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Vice Provost Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The program has made strong progress in revising its SLOA in response to the 2023 midcycle review, especially in differentiating SLOs between the BA in Fisheries and the BS in Fisheries and Marine Sciences. The SLOs are well constructed, clearly aligned with program expectations, and supported by defined assessment procedures and tools. However, the program should include the evidence (data) used to assess each SLO and provide clearer narrative distinctions about which SLO is being addressed, particularly when describing curricular changes and their relationship to the SLOA. Declines in student success metrics warrant further investigation—requesting more detailed PAIR data may help determine whether these patterns reflect program-specific or institution-wide issues. For the 2027 midcycle review, the program should provide direct evidence of assessment, document continuous improvement more explicitly, and offer clearer explanations of how curricular changes support each revised SLO.

Student success trends show strong growth in enrollment due to online and asynchronous offerings, stable pass rates, and relatively high persistence supported by personalized advising. However, emerging disparities affecting [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] students require deeper analysis and targeted strategies. As the program grows, reliance on small class sizes may no longer be sustainable, and the inability to fully disaggregate pass-rate data makes identifying root causes challenging. Strengths such as advising, capstone and research experiences, field practica, and writing-intensive coursework continue to support communication, critical thinking, and core disciplinary skills. Moving forward, the program should consider strategies tailored to online, working, and nontraditional students, and cohort-based monitoring may strengthen efforts to evaluate retention, graduation, and post-graduate success.

The program provides clear evidence of strong HIP integration from first-year experience through the capstone, and the identified practices are well aligned with the SLOA. These HIPs include diversity and global learning, cross-cultural engagement, experiential fieldwork, undergraduate research, and partnerships that support real-world application—each of which contributes meaningfully to student learning. While the review found the HIPs intentional and effective, the program could strengthen this section by providing explicit examples of capstone projects and clearly documenting how each HIP category is implemented and assessed. Overall, the evidence reflects a thoughtful approach to HIP integration, and these activities remain a key indicator of the program's commitment to enhancing student learning outcomes.



Department Profile and Financial Data

Department Name: Fisheries, Marine Biology, Oceanography

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:

Departmental resources are shared by delivering this program jointly among the three CFOS departments. Departments share classrooms, laboratories, and instructional technology facilitating interdisciplinary teaching and efficient use of facilities. For example, cross-listing cohort-building courses such as FISH F103 (MBI F103, OCN F103) allows for instructional efficiency by rotating its delivery among departments, allowing students to benefit from disciplinary viewpoints. Many 600-level course have been stacked, making more electives available to our undergraduates (without having to develop new courses), increasing overall enrollment in these courses, and promoting teaching efficiency and mentoring across academic levels. Graduate students from the three departments serve as TAs or graders for undergraduate courses, contributing to the cost effectiveness in the delivery of the BS. Staff and academic coordinators are shared among departments, ensuring that limited resources are deployed strategically to support high-quality, interdisciplinary instruction.

Associated Programs

Program Name	Degree Type
Fisheries	BA
Fisheries	MS
Fisheries	PhD
Marine Policy	MMP
Marine Biology	MS
Marine Biology	PhD
Marine Studies	MMS
Oceanography	MS
Oceanography	PhD

Collaborator Name(s):

Russ Hopcroft, Lara Hortsmann

Collaborator Email(s):

rrhopcroft@alaska.edu, lahortsmann



Financial Data

Department Name: **Fisheries, Marine Biology, Oceanography**

Academic Year 2025/2026

	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	For Data Entry Staff	For Programs and Review Committees
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	2602	2908	3427	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.	
Service SCH	1460	1319	1606	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	52.535	45.95	55.575	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Total SCH per Department FTE	49.53	63.29	61.66		
Service SCH per Department FTE	27.79	28.71	28.90		
Majors in Programs	216	237	322	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.	
Department FTE's	52.535	45.95	55.575	This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Majors per Department FTE	4.11	5.16	5.79		

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	319.34	345.5	386	Department faculty's workload units assigned to teaching
Service Units	103	98.5	91.1	Department faculty's workload units assigned to service
Research Units	283.66	277	257.5	Department faculty's workload units assigned to research

Full-Time Equivalent Worksheet*	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Faculty FTEs	20.7	18.2	18.7	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	16.46	14.25	20.375	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	15.375	13.5	16.5	Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.
Total Department FTEs	52.535	45.95	55.575	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 30th in the year 2025 (DKQ - 2025.10.16)**