



Academic Program Review

Program Name: Music Education – Bachelor of Music

Academic Year 2025/2026

Recent Recommendations

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

Response:

- 1) The recent recommendations suggested that while SLO numbers 1–4 were very good, that SLO #5 should not be used for evaluation as it consists of post-graduation activities. It was recommended that SLO #5 be removed, and this has been done.
- 2) It was further recommended that assessments seek to move away from using tests and quizzes as artifacts. While the program faculty agree that this would be ideal, certain coursework needs to be evaluated through abstract thought processes, and frankly the classroom testing environment is quickly becoming a better ground for assessment than writing assignments are due to the proliferation of Large Language Models. We believe that testing still has an important role to play, especially in coursework that involves the building and progress of basic skills prior to coursework that allows for real-life applications. For example, a student in MUED 110 is learning about the process a teacher goes through for teaching and learning for the first time, and the culminating examination is an important benchmark in student readiness to teach children directly in the following MUED 201 course. Without some check for an understanding of the relationship between teaching and learning, we do not believe a student has adequate training to teach children effectively. Likewise, the resulting "real world" application of skill for a subject such as music theory is the analysis of musical works or the composition of new works. Tests for this coursework includes both, but with focused examples emphasizing the specific course work for each level of the class. The program will work with faculty to identify other possible rubric for this task, but in our view tests are extremely valid for assessing knowledge in a subject which primarily deals with abstract information.
- 3) Additional commentary about prior SLOA changes in the 2023 school year was requested. The first major change was to SLO #3a, which is intended to evaluate core music education curriculum knowledge. Previously, this has evaluated student achievement at music methods courses (MUED 315). However, it was determined by the program that a change was needed. Although students were successful at achieving this benchmark, I did not find that it was well-correlated with success in other SLOs, as scoring tended to be higher for these courses than for others. Also, while methods courses are an important part of the curriculum, they are a supportive and specialized rather than core to learning to teach. For these reasons, it was decided that data from the MUED classroom courses (110, 201, 309, 405) and MUED practicum courses (310, 316, 406) would be both better indicators of student success and of core understandings of the program. The other change was to SLO #4. In this case the previous SLO was only evaluating student internships via observation. Although this is viable, we felt that a more comprehensive and accurate artifact would be the ATCAT, which includes but observation and writing elements. While not a substantial change, we believe that this will lead to a better picture of student achievement that will better align with the spirit of the SLO. This also allows for a more comprehensive integration of communication outcomes as these classes involve large volumes of oral and written work.
- 4) We believe these changes show that we are "closing the loop" by making changes that more accurately assess student learning.

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:

It is difficult to presume changes from a small sample size over a small number of years, but a number of things are apparent from data analysis that are either interesting or worth watching. SLOA 1a and 2a shows consistent student achievement. Music Theory scores are very similar to the previous cycle of data, showing a gradual growth in student achievement from the first semester course to the fourth semester course. Music History scores have increased rather significantly compared to the previous cycle. This perhaps indicates an improvement in the post-Covid world, but further data will have to be gathered to determine if this is a trend or not, as the sample sizes are under 10.

SLOA 2a The averages from the jury rubric is lowest at the introductory MUS 161 level. Despite the fact that faculty generally grade with greater rigor as students progress through the program, and that the rigor of performed repertory also increases, scores rise from an average of 83.4% to 87.4% by MUS 362. This suggests student progress in the face of greater challenges, which is a very nice thing to see. There has been a drop in scoring compared to the previous cycle of data. Students are still passing, but average scores have dropped in general. More data may be needed to indicate if this is a trend.

SLOA 2b A new element was added to the Junior Recital, requiring students to pass a pre-hearing before giving the junior recital performance. This is an additional measure to help students be fully prepared for the summative performance. This has resulted in some delayed performances since implementation, but all recital performances have passed since then, so we feel that this has been a successful change.

SLOA 3a Similarly to SLOA 2a, there is a progress of student achievement over course levels in spite of increasing challenges and rigor. For classroom courses, students average a score of 93.7% on the MUED 110 rubric, but by MUED 405 this has increased to 98.9%. Likewise what is usually the first practicum course, MUED 310, scores an average of 88.3% on the rubric, while for MUED 406 the average is 92.8%. This suggests a growth of student capabilities and a progression of student skills over time. This data is not substantially different from the previous cycle.

SLOA 3b continues not to be a barrier for traditional students, but some have needed to retake the exam when taking the tests outside of the suggested schedule. It is generally suggested that students take the Praxis CORE or equivalent exams upon completion of the associated GER coursework, especially for math, as soon as the next semester break. Students who have followed this model are highly successful at passing the test on the first attempt. Likewise with the Praxis II Music Content exam, it is recommended that students take the test upon completion of major MUED and MUS coursework, with strong student achievement when this is done. However, students seem to struggle when they do not follow this advice, and for non-traditional students who are completing this degree after a prior bachelor's degree, it can also become a barrier. My hope is to provide students with greater incentives for completing this requirement at the suggested time, perhaps through some sort of progress acknowledgement. Although this is a small thing, I think any progress here would greatly help those students.

SLOA 4a The rubric for the ATCAT given during the Student Teaching semester has been updated for clarity and readability, but is largely unchanged. Students have been successful at passing the ATCAT, and scores remain high for it. The instructor notes that sometimes interventions are needed to aid students, and curriculum changes are being made to better prepare students for the ATCAT.

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:

The only change was to eliminate SLO #5, as was recommended, as it was tracking post-baccalaureate success and was deemed a poor measure for a SLO.

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:

Per the recommendation of the review committee, SLO #5 has been eliminated.

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:

Capstone Courses: ED 452/453/454 are considered capstone courses for their respective concentrations within the BM Music Education degree. These courses involve the practical, real-world application of all previously learned courses within the major. The ATCAT is the culminating project of this course, which evaluates the ability of the student to understand a “full cycle” of teaching—understanding one’s students, planning instruction, delivering instruction, understanding data from the instruction, and then reflecting upon all phases. It provides an important “snapshot” of what the student will look like as a teacher.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects are an important part of several courses within the program.

Highlighted in the SLOA is the Curriculum collaboration project in MUED 405, where students are grouped together and collaboratively design curriculum for a non-performance music course.

Internship is part of the capstone requirement of the BM Music Education degree. As the last course of the major, students are assigned to intern at a public school (often, but not exclusively, in Fairbanks) for the purpose of learning within the school environment itself about being a teacher. Students are paired with an experienced veteran teacher who is jointly chosen by the Music Department and by school district administration. Students spend the semester adhering to the school workday and are evaluated by observation forms and the ATCAT, which assesses preparedness for understanding the teaching/learning cycle.

Writing-Intensive Courses are very important in the education field as they prepare students not only for future graduate work in research, but also because writing continues to be a very important communication medium to parents, administrators, and the community at large in the field of education. For this reason, large amounts of writing are incorporated into MUED 110, 201, 309, and 405. Writing is critiqued for both content and presentability with an emphasis on obtaining a formal style of expression. A Philosophy of Music Education paper is also a document first created in MUED 110 and revised in subsequent courses, with the goal of this eventually being a document that can be used for job applications. The rubric for the MUED 201 course is highlighted in the SLOA.

Practicums are considered critical to preparation for the student internship semester. MUED 310, 316, and 406 act as formal practicums where a student is paired with a local public school teacher for the purpose of experiencing the teaching environment. They have an assignment of teaching and video recording themselves teaching two separate lessons within these classrooms, which is evaluated in the SLOA.

Studios are an important aspect of any music program. All majors are enrolled with an Applied Music professor whose students are counted as a studio. Teachers then provide group learning experiences through a variety of avenues, including weekly masterclasses, studio recitals, and other activities. The Junior Recital, MUS 390 is the ultimate expression of this, which is evaluated in the SLOA.

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: Decrease

Degrees Awarded: Increase

Other Trends (if applicable):

It should be noted that all of these trends are small and are the results in the shifts of roughly 2 or 3 students per year.

Achievement Disparities

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

Response:

There are not any noticeable trends in the disaggregated data outside of an increase in students declining to identify a race, which might be notable if it is a trend in other departments. Outside of that, it is hard to draw conclusions from such small numbers with such a small base of students. Our balance of race, ethnicity, and genders appears to be consistent, and is in line with the demographics of the state, and student success appears to be strong across the board.

We will continue to monitor this data, but for now we believe that we are doing well at having equitable outcomes for our students.

Closing the Loop

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

Response:

In all we believe that our Student Learning Outcomes are strongly correlated with student success. Data shows that students who go through successive coursework achieve higher scores in spite of greater amounts of rigor and required work. This suggests that overall student knowledge and skill are growing over the course of the program, leading to success upon degree completion and entry into the workforce. Faculty meet regularly to discuss SLOs and other assessments to ensure that continuous improvements to the program are being made.

Due to the high degree of personal involvement with student progress, changes are often made at the curriculum level even before being identified in data gathered at the end of semesters. Nonetheless, this information is regularly considered and adjustments made accordingly.

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 BM Music Education degree advances both the arts and education in the state of Alaska. The program prepares students for becoming teachers in Alaska's public schools so that they can share the gift of music with students in kindergarten through high school.

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

Response:

UAF has the only undergraduate Music Education degree in the state of Alaska that results in certification upon graduation. Although UAA has a similar program, it does not result in certification, and additional coursework must be pursued in order to become certified. For this reason, the UAF BM Music Education degree is unique within the UA system.

Who are your key community or external partners?

Response:

The most internal partner for the program is the UAF School of Education, which provides a number of courses, important advice, and which shares CAEP accreditation with the degree program. External partners include the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District, the Alaska Music Educators Association, the National Association for Music Education, and other school districts and teachers around the state.

What role do your service courses play, if any?

Response:

None

How do your graduates succeed after leaving the program?

Response:

Graduates have been successful in obtaining employment in Alaska's public schools upon graduation. Not every student has decided to immediately pursue a career, but all that wanted to have been successful at gaining employment in their chosen field.

Submitter and Collaborator Names:

Daniel Strawser and Jaunelle Celaire

Submitter Email:

dmstrawser@alaska.edu

Committee Review

Program Name: Music Education – Bachelor of Music

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:

Data is being used to “close the loop.” This program review offers a comprehensive and close evaluation of data to explain the program’s practices and the changes that have been made. Some of the changes in student success and equity appear to be indicative of a small cohort, and not necessarily significant trends that can inform decision-making. The program demonstrates that strategies have been implemented for improvement, and they have made changes based on past advice. The strength of this program lies in its high impact practices, ties with the community, and the interdisciplinary nature of the Music Education program. In addition, within the Music Department the data demonstrates that it consistently operates at some of the highest levels regarding graduation persistence and degree completion. Its goal of advancing arts and education throughout Alaska speaks to the value of this degree.

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 Active Verbs | ☐ Missing a Direct Measure |
| ☐ Missing Collaboration within Department | ☐ Missing Curricular Connection |

SLOA Feedback Narrative:

SLOAs are strong. Previous recommendations have been addressed successfully: SLO # 5 has been removed; and the retention of classroom assessments and explanation of previous changes justified. Evidencing faculty efforts, analysis of SLOAs looks promising and encouraging. The overall sample sizes were small, hopefully, future monitoring will demonstrate the establishment of these trends.

Loop is closing nicely.

The student learning objectives are clearly stated, and several exist to evaluate different aspects of theoretical and applied knowledge. The outcomes are clear and measurable, and they align with program goals.

Student assessments are varied, with exams, juries, and the Praxis all playing different roles to evaluate academic performance and mastery. Each assessment is aligned with stated outcomes. The findings are particularly meaningful in that outside exams provide the ultimate measurement of student achievement. Rubrics provide both qualitative and quantitative feedback so allow students to understand where there is room for growth. The narrative reflects that results have been used to inform changes and to explain the processes that remain and why they are valuable.

Student Success and Equity Feedback

Narrative:

The program notes a decrease in persistence and majors, but an increase in student credit hours and degrees awarded that is not explained. However, the shifts are noted as small (2-3 students per year). Small student numbers and a lack of data (on e.g. ethnicity) mean a lack of inferences to be drawn. The committee affirms the program's plan to monitor this data.

High Impact Practices Feedback

Narrative:

HIPs are well aligned with SLOs. Interventions (e.g. capstones; practicums; collaborative assignments; and/or internships). Notably, the latter involve highly aligned activities such as planning, studio work, recitals, or writing intensive practices. All in all, the program should be commended for their efforts to provide students with real-world opportunities to perfection and apply what they have learned.

Loop is closing nicely.

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:

Mary Ludwig, Eduardo Wilner, Brad Moran

Dean Review

Program Name: Music Education – Bachelor of Music

Academic Year 2025/2026

Dean Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

I agree with the committee's careful and thoughtful review of the Music Education BM program. I recommend department faculty focus on program recruitment to increase major numbers from the current 19 BM students. Credit load for the Music BM is very high (84) compared to other CLA BA programs (30-39) and BFA programs (64). I recommend faculty review curricular requirements for the BM. This high credit load may be discouraging students from majoring in the Music BM. I recommend department faculty work closely with our PIO team to facilitate advertising and recruitment for the program, specific courses, and outreach activities. Recent updating to course fees to reflect the growing cost of materials, instruments, tuning, and performance space upkeep and maintenance is important and needs continued vigilance. Overall, cost of Music Department programs is very high, so faculty should make efforts to reduce costs and increase departmental revenue through enrollment, tuition, fees, grants, ticket sales, and space rentals.

Recommendation to University-Wide Committee No

Vice Provost Review

Program Name: Music Education – Bachelor of Music

Academic Year 2025/2026

Vice Provost Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

Although the four music programs reviewed are distinct, the evaluations are similar due to related curricular structures and SLOA frameworks. The program followed 2023 mid-cycle guidance and revised the SLOA and SLOs, which are strong and appropriately assess graduate knowledge, skills, and abilities. Four SLOs were provided, each with clear assessment procedures, implementation plans, and artifacts/rubrics included in the supplementary folder. For future reviews, the program should also provide the data used to assess SLOs and continue strengthening the narrative overview to clearly demonstrate achievement of each outcome. If no curricular changes occur, the program should discuss curriculum strengths based on assessment findings. For the 2027 mid-cycle review, include direct evidence and a detailed narrative showing how assessment data informs decisions and whether revisions to the SLOA or curriculum are needed. Closing the loop on assessment is essential for NWCCU expectations and should include documentation showing how assessment results lead to meaningful, evidence-based changes that enhance program quality and student learning.

The program provides a thorough review of PAIR data and notes trends in persistence, enrollment, pass rates, and degrees awarded. High-impact practices supporting student success are highlighted, including capstone courses, practicums and internships, studio instruction, writing-intensive assignments, and collaborative projects. Outcomes appear equitable across race, ethnicity, and gender, and individualized faculty support is emphasized, particularly for non-traditional students. However, small cohort sizes limit statistical significance, and there is no explicit discussion of interventions for students at risk beyond faculty mentorship. A small shift in students declining to identify race should be monitored across cohorts. Future reviews should include strategies tied to dashboard insights and provide measurable goals for retention and equity.

The HIPs carried out by this program were well documented and reported, with evidence that these practices are reviewed and contribute to measuring student learning outcomes and overall program effectiveness.



Department Profile and Financial Data

Department Name: **Music**

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:

All of our undergraduate courses consist of the same "core" curriculum, which helps us to share costs between programs. This includes 32 hours of coursework that are common to each undergraduate program. Additionally, applied music lessons and ensembles are common to all undergraduate and graduate programs, meaning that substantial amounts of coursework can be delivered by the same faculty without occurring new expenses for each program. Music elective courses are common between the BA and BM Music Performance Degree, and faculty efforts for these electives are used also for graduate level courses. The BM Music Education degree also shares courses with the School of Education, further defraying costs. We also have the cross listed course, MUS 410 - Women in Music history. The department also offers 4 GER courses, MUS F103X, F125X, F200X, and F223X. These courses are designed with non-musicians in mind and help us to gain tuition dollars by offering these as large courses.

The Music Department also has sought other means of offsetting the costs of our programs through creative use of resources and facilities. We are in the process of developing a mega course called Beginning Guitar. This will be an asynchronous class starting in spring 2026.

We also lease the Davis concert hall and the facilities to outside users to offset operational costs.

Another innovation has been the Music Community School through which our music majors teach private music lessons to the Fairbanks community in exchange for payment which further goes to defray operating costs within the department.

Associated Programs

Program Name	Degree Type
Music Performance	BM
Music	BA
Music Performance	MM

Collaborator Name(s):

Daniel Strawser, Jaunelle Celaire

Collaborator Email(s):

dmstrawser@alaska.edu, jcelaire@alaska.edu



Financial Data

Department Name: **Music**

Academic Year 2025/2026

	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	For Data Entry Staff	For Programs and Review Committees
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	1426	1589	1671	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.	
Service SCH	890	1057	1006	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	8.325	9.6	9.6	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Total SCH per Department FTE	171.29	165.52	174.06		
Service SCH per Department FTE	106.91	110.10	104.79		

Majors in Programs	38	41	45	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.	
Department FTE's	8.325	9.6	9.6	This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Majors per Department FTE	4.56	4.27	4.69		

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	106.25	125.25	123	Department faculty's workload units assigned to teaching
Service Units	15.75	33.75	39	Department faculty's workload units assigned to service
Research Units	27.25	35.25	37	Department faculty's workload units assigned to research

Full-Time Equivalent Worksheet*	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Faculty FTEs	4.75	5.75	5.75	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	1.2	1.1	1.1	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	2	2	2	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	0.375	0.75	0.75	Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.
Total Department FTEs	8.325	9.6	9.6	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: (Contributor Name Here)

Date: