Academic Program Review

Program Name: Physics - Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Recent Recommendations

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

Response:

Recommendations in italics:

The program provided 4 SLOs for the Physics BS SLOA plan. The review panel offers the following recommendations to improve upon the program's SLOAs:

- SLO #s1-2 are appropriate as measures of student learning.

- SLO # 3 is a program outcome and not tied to student learning.

- With regard to SLO #3, the program is encouraged to retain this measure of outcome assessment for their own internal tracking purposes (just not use it as part of program review). Post-graduation activities, such as graduate school/job placement are not considered an assessment of student learning and are instead program outcomes.

We modified SLO #3 so that it doesn't include post-graduation activities, but we plan to keep track of these via alumni interviews, as recommended.

- With regard to SLO #4, the recommendation from the review panel is to re-frame this as a communications SLO.

We modified SLO #4 to reframe it as a communications focused SLO as recommended.

- Per guidance from the NWCCU for accreditation purposes, they recommend that degree programs have between 3-5 SLOs per program.

The review panel notes that some of the assessment criteria needs to be revised. For example, maintaining a strong international reputation is not an assessment.

We revised the assessment criteria.

The review panel appreciates the program's discussion of the SLOAs. For the full program review, which occurs in two years, we look forward to the program's revisit of SLOA best practices as well as providing artifacts used for data collection, as this would strengthen the program review.

With respect to curricular changes, we understand that having additional faculty would be helpful in achieving the program's curricular objectives. For the full program review, we look forward to seeing if any of the desired curricular changes were implemented and if they improved student engagement and success.

Following NWCCU guidance, SLOA plans must emphasize "closing the loop" and continuous improvement, ensuring each SLO within the plan is assessed individually to verify alignment with program objectives. If a SLO fails to produce the expected assessment outcome, adjustments to SLO language, substantial changes to the SLO, or revisions to data collection rubrics are necessary to ensure alignment and facilitate program improvement.

We had one successful faculty hire (who was on teaching release for her first year) and a second joined appointment faculty member will start instructing next calendar year.

The program noted an increase in persistence and degrees awarded. The review panel agrees that there has been an increase in persistence, but saw a decline in degrees awarded. Additionally, the program noted a decline in majors, SCH, and pass rates.

The program did not identify any equity gaps. Program numbers are small, which does make it difficult to identify trends, but the program could have reflected on things like an increase in women enrolling in the program, as well as an increase in first generation students.

It would be helpful to see some discussion of the tags that were chosen, and to discuss how the program will address declines in majors, SCH, and pass rates. Additionally, what are some ways the program can support students to reach degree completion?

We continue to have low numbers of graduating students. The issue, however, is not retention; we simply have low recruitment numbers, which is not directly in the department's control. We started working with some Physics programs in local high schools. In the past two years we saw an increase in Physics majors and we anticipate higher graduation rates to follow.

The program identified writing-intensive courses, capstone courses/projects, collaborative assignments/projects, and UG research as HIPs. A narrative was provided for each HIP, but it was not clear where these HIPs fit into the program or if all students are required to complete them to meet graduation requirements.

The review panel recommends including examples to demonstrate/highlight each HIP, similar to what was provided for collaborative assignments/projects (this was a great example).

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

The review panel recognizes that the HIPs employed by the Physics program are all positive and meaningful in preparing students to enter the workforce.

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:

We have again very small numbers of respondents, due to the small number of upper-level and graduating majors at the moment. The issues raised in the annual undergraduate survey and in the exit interview remain similar to those in the mid-cycle review: Students generally rated the program positively (our long-term exit interview response is 33% Excellent, 47% Very Good, 18% Good). Students wished for additional offering of classes and possibly some restructuring, for example regarding the introduction and use of computational tools.

In our SLO we address 'Basic Physical Understanding'. One assessment tool is the nationally recognized and use the 'Force Concept Inventory (FCI)' test. Its purpose is to test the concepts being taught in introductory physics, rather than specific problem solving skills. This test is administered at the beginning and then again at the end of PHYS 211. We find that our students enter the Physics classes underprepared with an initial FCI score of 41%. This score improved to 83%, a significant improvement. The normalized gain (actual gain relative to total possible gain) was 70%, which is considered excellent. In the second instance (since mid-cycle) the normalized gain was 37%, which is lower, but still in the range considered normal for 'active engagement classes'. Note that the students in this class are overwhelmingly engineering students, not Physics majors, so the assessment is not program specific.

Physics majors are required to complete a Capstone requirement and the SLO plan assesses the success through faculty surveys of final presentations. Presentations are about equally rated
'Very Good' and 'Excellent' (~40% each) with some 'Good' (15%) and about 5% of 'Satisfactory'. Faculty comment on 'Demonstrate knowledge of previous work', 'Use of data to formulate or support hypothesis', 'Clear distinction of interpretation of data', and 'Clear statement of conclusions'. The latter was generally well rated, but all the other categories showed no clear picture with about equal ratings between 'Good' and 'Excellent'.

An assessment of SLO #1 looks at grades of final exams. This is done, because exam scores have proven to be a better indicator of understanding than homework assignments, because many homework solutions can be found online. This metric shows a mixed picture. For most of our upper level physics classes we have had average final scores well below 75% (with a few exceptions), which is the stated desired average. Since these classes were taught by the same faculty, we feel that we had an unusual amount of struggling students, compared to earlier years. But we also recognize that in an age of online availability of solutions, students may be under the wrong impression that they are doing quite well, based on homework, while in fact they are struggling with basic understanding and how to approach a problem. This is something we actively discuss in the department and are looking for solutions.

In the mid-cycle review we remarked on the fact that we have currently no lee-way in terms of class offerings. Cuts to the department have been so drastic that we are barely able to teach the core curriculum. In the meantime we have hired two new junior faculty members (0.25 FTE and 0.5 FTE). Neither of them has taught yet, but we anticipate being able to address some of the course diversity issues with these new hires, particularly through more frequent offering of our 1-cr modules.

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:

We did not make any curricular changes based on previous reviews. Current staffing levels make such changes impossible. However, staffing levels are improving. Overall, we think that we offer a strong Physics BS. Unfortunately, degree requirements for the BS are quite high in terms of required Physics credit hours, if we want to adequately prepare students for postgraduate work. In order to offer more opportunities for diversification, we are working on returning the Physics BA program. This would come at no cost and would allow those students who seek more diverse options for classes (this was expressed in surveys) another possible option. This is particularly attractive for students who do not wish to pursue graduate studies (about 55% according to our Exit Survey).

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:

We have modified the SLOA document following recommendations from the mid-cycle review (see above). This includes reformulation of one of the SLO's as communication focused.

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:

Capstone Courses and Presentations: These play a central role in our SLOA and affect most of the desired outcomes through giving the students research experience (SLO #1), and teaching them oral and written communication skills (SLO #2-4).
Undergraduate research: This is an integral part of SLO#1.
Labs: Advanced Physics Labs (PHYS 381) is part of the evaluation for SLO#2
Writing Intensive Courses: Project reports are required for PHYS 220 and more intensively for PHYS 381, which is used in SLO#2
Communication: This is evaluated for three of the four SLO's, mainly through the Capstone requirement with a required oral presentation.

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: Increase
Student Credit Hours: Increase
Majors: NoChange
Degrees Awarded: Decrease

Other Trends (if applicable):

Graduation-Informed persistence saw a slight increase from 83.3% in FY21 to 77.4% in FY23 and increased to 79.2% in FY25. Student credit hours (SCH) for lower division physics courses have seen an increase from 1,256 in FY21 to 1,764 in FY25. SCH for upper division courses have seen a decline, highly attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic, from 239 in FY21 to a low of 68 in FY23. They have steadily been increasing since - with 70 SCH in FY24 and 116 in FY25. The number of undergraduate physics majors saw a dip from 38 in FY21 to 33 in FY23, and increasing back to 38 in FY25. The percentage of [redacted] physics majors has seen an increase from 22.2% in 2021 to 27.1% in 2025. The department has seen an increase in [redacted] students who made up 22% of physics majors in FY25, an increase from 19% in FY21.

Achievement Disparities

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

Response:

The average course pass rate is depicted slightly higher for [redacted] students at 82.9% than [redacted] students at 79.9%. This has shifted from a passing rate of 81.9% in [redacted] students and 80.6% of [redacted] students in FY21. The department has seen a slight drop in [redacted], and [redacted] physics majors, who made up a total of 13.55% majors in FY25 - a drop from 28.55% in FY21.

Closing the Loop

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

Response:

Many of the high impact practices of this program revolve around conducting undergraduate research and presenting that research in both written and oral form. This is formalized through the Capstone requirement. This requirement and the faculty assessment of the research carried out and the communication of it form a central theme in our SLOA.

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 Physics Department contributes to this mission through a program of teaching, research and service in physics to the community, the nation and the world. The Department offers undergraduate degrees in Physics, with concentrations in Computational Physics, Applied Physics, Atmospheric Physics and Technical Management.

All faculty members provide instruction, research and service, consistent with the UAF mission. The curriculum includes three distance-delivery courses to rural communities, thereby contributing to UAF's mission of providing opportunities to students who are not physically located in the Fairbanks area and other non-traditional students. Additional efforts to reach non-traditional students are achieved through access to introductory physics courses in the evening. Faculty members in the Physics Department support the UAF Strategic Plan through a strong emphasis on research relevant to the Arctic and the high-latitude local of UAF; e.g., atmospheric sciences, snow, ice and permafrost, remote sensing, and space physics. These are fully supportive of the UAF mission as a Land, Sea and Space Grant university. Student outcomes indicate that graduates of the department's programs are quite successful, consistent with our belief that the programs are of high quality. Our mission is to provide appropriate instructional and research opportunities to students in pursuit of their career goals.

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

Response:

The Physics B.S. program is closely connected to other programs in the UA system. Our courses provide a core science foundation for a number of other majors. These include engineering, chemistry, geophysics and other STEM majors. The analytical skills students gain in the physics program complement other majors and prepare them for a variety of careers or graduate study, making the program an important component of the STEM community in the UA system. Several classes that are requirements for our majors are also requirements for other degrees (PHYS 211/212) or electives for engineering and geoscience students (PHYS 213/220/301)

Who are your key community or external partners?

Response:

The Geophysical Institute and other reserach entities at UAF, the Fairbanks North Star Borough school district - in regards to outreach and recruitment.

What role do your services courses play, if any?

Response:

The physics department plays a strong role in contributing to the core curriculum in the natural sciences and engineering. Several physics courses are part of the core requirements and provide natural science opportunities for engineering and science degree majors. Each course includes a weekly laboratory that expands upon the lecture materials and provides training in observation and reporting.

How do your graduates succeed after leaving the program?

Response:

Graduates of the physics undergraduate program succeed by finding employment in their related field or pursuing further education by entering a graduate program. Based on the responses collected from the physics undergraduate alumni survey the department sends out, 62.5% of responders are employed with 29.2% of responders attending a full time educational program. According to 2025 AIP Physics Trends on Physics Bachelors 1 year post graduation, 55% entered the workforce, 30% entered a graduate study program in astronomy or physics, and 15% entered a graduate study program in other fields. From those who had entered the workforce, 28% were in the private sector, 6% were employed by colleges/universities, 5% were employed by the government, 3% became high school teachers, 1% were active duty military, and 5% were categorized as "other." 7% of the workforce sector were actively seeking employment.

Submitter and Collaborator Names:

Martin Truffer, Liya Billa

Submitter Email:

mtruffer2@alaska.edu ka.edu

Committee Review

Program Name: Physics - 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.

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

Explanation of Overall Recommendations

Response:

The BS Physics program supports the UAF mission through strong teaching, research, and service, offering several undergraduate concentrations and expanding access through online and evening courses. The program is struggling with faculty support, but has two recent faculty hires, which should take some of the pressure off and enable more courses to be offered. Faculty research in Arctic and space-related fields aligns with UAF's Land, Sea, and Space Grant goals. The program partners with the Geophysical Institute and UAF engineering and STEM majors. Student outcomes show that their graduates are prepared for their degree related careers and the program has strong job placement rates. Most graduates either enter the workforce or pursue further education, with roughly 62% employed and about 30% in full-time graduate programs. This shows that the BS Physics program is closing the loop by having their graduates moving into a wide range of sectors, including private industry, higher education, government, teaching, and other fields. Despite the low faculty numbers, the program has been resourceful, leading to increased student outcomes and potential future boosts in enrollment. The narrative and data provided emphasize the need for increased diversity and frequency of course offerings and opportunities for applied science topics being taught in lower division courses. With the new incoming faculty, it is recommended that the program continues to improve on its SLOs and assessment tools, including providing SLOA artifacts, and developing rubrics. Strategies to address areas for improvement (number of degrees awarded and persistence) should be discussed in future reports.

Student Learning Outcomes Feedback

- ☐ Strong
- ☐ Developing
- ☑ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback

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

SLOA Feedback Narrative:

_ The Physics BS program continues to suffer from low faculty numbers. Given this fact, the program is commended for working to address the mid-cycle review feedback. Several improvements were carried out since the last review, but have not yet come to fruition. The program just filled one full-time hire and two part-time hires.

SLOs are measurable and align with program goals through Force Concept Inventory (FCI) Test for Introductory Physics, capstone project presentations, and final exam grades. The program reports that it continues to have small numbers of upper level and graduating majors, resulting in very few survey responses. Despite the small survey size, feedback remains consistently positive and evidence shows that students are gaining skills and knowledge through the program. The Force Concept Inventory (FCI) test assesses student learning of the concepts being taught in Introductory Physics. It is administered at the beginning and end of PHYS 211. FCI scores indicate students enter the course underprepared but show strong gains by the end (41% to 70%).

There continues to be a need for new faculty to increase course offerings and frequencies at which they are taught, as requested by students. New faculty and course offerings would likely build recruitment and overall excitement for the program. Recent new hires will help in this area.

The program has not been able to change its curriculum as suggested in the mid-cycle review because they did not have enough instructors. These identified curricular improvements included incorporation of computational techniques into intro physics courses, new applied physics course offerings such as biophysics and engineering physics, and generally making the program more flexible for students including relaxing some prerequisites.

As part of the potential curricula improvements, the program pointed out that the Physics BS is a strong degree, but it requires many physics classes which are difficult to teach with the limited faculty numbers. To give students more flexibility, they are proposing a Physics BA at no additional cost. This would provide another option for students who want a wider variety of classes, especially for the many students who do not plan to go to graduate school for Physics.

With the addition of new faculty, the review committee would expect that prior to the next mid-cycle review, some of these improvements would be developed and implemented and that appropriate updates to the SLOs and SLOAs would be made. The committee also recommends implementing rubrics to collect presentation data. The committee supports the creation of the BA program as a potential way to boost enrollment.

Student Success and Equity Feedback

Narrative:

The program examined the Student Success Dashboard and identified equity gaps. The program saw an increase in Physics majors, female majors, and Pell grant eligible students, although the program continues to face low enrollment. Degrees awarded and persistence decreased, but the program saw an increase in SCH and pass rates. Persistence increased from 77.4% in FY23 to 79.2% in FY25, which is a good improvement. There was a drop of underrepresented groups from 29% in FY21 to 14% in FY25. The review committee encourages the program to develop a plan to increase equity in the program with a goal of reaching the higher numbers seen in the past. Strategies to address gaps and trends are not discussed in the report and should be in the future.

High Impact Practices Feedback

Narrative:

HIPs include capstone courses, undergraduate research, labs, writing-intensive courses, and communications. Capstone courses and presentations are the main assessment tools for giving students research experience (SLO #1) and teaching oral communication skills (SLO #2-4). Undergraduate research directly supports SLO #1 related to research competency, while advanced labs and writing-intensive courses contribute to evaluating communication and reporting skills. Communication is assessed across several outcomes, especially through the required capstone oral presentation.

HIPs are integrated into the degree program, but could be more clearly defined and linked to the SLOAs. Examples could be provided along with more details on how these lead to "closing the loop" for students in long-term outcomes.

Profile Feedback

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

Financial Feedback

- [ ] High Tuition Revenues
- [ ] Operates at Low Cost
- [x] Opportunities to Increase Revenue
- [ ] High Grant Revenues
- [ ] Productive Faculty
- [x] Low Enrollment

Reviewer Names:

Carrie Baker, Chris Maio, Mark Conde

Dean Review

Program Name: Physics - Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Dean Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The Bachelor of Physics program at UAF is unique in the UA system. Despite strong learning outcomes, it suffers from low to moderate enrollment, and as a result of low tuition income, a relatively low number of faculty. The program is academically strong, with students meeting SLO and preparation for job placements. However, the low enrollment questions the sustainability of this unique program in Alaska.

Recommendation to University-Wide Committee No

Vice Provost Review

Program Name: Physics - Bachelor of Science

Academic Year 2025/2026

Vice Provost Feedback

Overall feedback narrative:

The program followed the guidance from the 2023 mid-cycle review and revised the SLOA and SLOs. Four SLOs were provided, each with clear assessment procedures and implementation plans, including where in the curriculum assessments occur. Assessment criteria and procedures are well documented, and the program provided a strong narrative overview of SLO assessments. However, artifacts, rubrics, and the data used to assess SLOs were not included and should be added for the 2027 mid-cycle review. The program noted no curricular changes and cited concerns with low staffing levels; in lieu of changes, the program should discuss curricular strengths based on evaluation. For the next review, include all evidence in the supplementary folder and detail any curricular changes made, their impact, and whether additional changes are needed based on assessment results. Closing the loop on assessment is essential for NWCCU expectations and should include evidence for each SLO to demonstrate meaningful, evidence-based improvements.

The program engages with PAIR dashboard data and tracks trends in persistence, pass rates, SCH, majors, degrees awarded, gender composition, Pell status, and race/ethnicity across multiple years, contextualizing COVID-era impacts on enrollment recovery. Accessibility is supported through distance delivery and evening classes for [redacted] students, and participation by [redacted] and [redacted] students has increased. The program also offers undergraduate research, labs, and capstone experiences. However, disparities remain, including gender differences in pass rates and declines in [redacted], [redacted], and [redacted] majors. While outreach to local high schools is noted, no concrete strategies are proposed to improve recruitment, retention beyond introductory courses, or upper-division persistence. Advising structures, degree planning, and early alert practices are not addressed. Future reviews should include targeted strategies and measurable interventions to support equity and retention.

The HIP section would benefit from revisions to include more description and detail on what HIPs entail and how they are measured and assessed within the program.

Department Profile and Financial Data only needs to be completed for programs undergoing FULL review.

Department Profile and Financial Data

Department Name: Physics

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 Physics B.S. program strives to use resources efficiently while maintaining a high-quality education. The department schedules courses carefully to maximize faculty time and classroom use, and we design lab activities that make the most of our existing equipment and facilities. At current staffing levels the department struggles to even offer the required classes and does have little leeway in class scheduling. In the past few years it was only possible to maintain the program due to a lack of sabbatical leave and several classes being scheduled as Independent Studies. As the number of our majors is increasing, we are hoping that our new faculty hires will ease that strain.

Associated Programs

Program Name	Degree Type
Physics	MS, PhD
Space Physics	PhD

Collaborator Name(s):

Martin Truffer, Liya Billa

Collaborator Email(s):

mtruffer2@alaska.edu

Financial Data only needs to be completed for programs undergoing FULL review.

Financial Data

Department Name: Physics

Academic Year 2025/2026

	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	For Data Entry Staff	For Programs and Review Committees
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	1857	1875	2158	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.	
Service SCH	1420	1464	1681	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	10.37	8.76	10.1	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Total SCH per Department FTE	179.07	214.04	213.66		
Service SCH per Department FTE	136.93	167.12	166.44		
Majors in Programs	63	52	59	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.	
Department FTE's	10.37	8.76	10.1	This field will auto-populate from the FTE Worksheet below.	
Majors per Department FTE	6.08	5.94	5.84		
Total Unrestricted Expenditures	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	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	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	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)	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	Expenses incurred for direct support of instruction within orgs identified as central or academic support, if applicable	
Total Expenditures	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]		
Tuition Revenue	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	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	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	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	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	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	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	Course Fees (9159)	
Other UA Receipts/Revenue	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	e.g. Performance and Sales Receipts, Space Rental Revenue, Indirect Cost Recovery (F1/F7); NOTE: COURSE FEES (9159) REPORTED ABOVE	
Total Revenue	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]		

Workload Allocation	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Teaching Units	97	121	142.5	Department facultys' workload units assigned to teaching
Service Units	43.5	29	32	Department facultys' workload units assigned to service
Research Units	118.5	73	127.5	Department facultys' workload units assigned to research

Full-Time Equivalent Worksheet*	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	
Faculty FTEs	4.42	3.95	4.54	**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	0.1	0.1	0.16	**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	3.11	2.6	2.55	**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	2.74	2.11	2.85	**Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.**
Total Department FTEs	10.37	8.76	10.1	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: Laycie N. Schnekenburger

Date: 9/26/2025