Check one:

**Full Proposal**
- [ ] New degree program
- [ ] New certificate program or administrative unit
- [ ] Major change in existing program
- [ ] Establishment of a new College or Department

**Abbreviated Proposal**
- [ ] Rename of an academic program or unit
- [ ] Reorganization – moving responsibility for an academic program from one unit to another
- [ ] Merging or splitting an academic unit
- [ ] Termination of an academic program or unit
- [ ] Suspension or reactivation of an academic program or unit

For proposals to establish a new center or institute, contact the Research Office (737-3437).

For requests to offer existing certificate and degree programs at new locations, use the New Location Request Form available on the Web: [http://www.ous.edu/aca/aca-forms.html](http://www.ous.edu/aca/aca-forms.html)

Title of Proposal: Reorganization of the College of Forestry

Effective Date: July 1, 2008

Department/Program:
- Department of Forest Resources
- Department of Forest Engineering
- Department of Forest Science

College:
- College of Forestry

I certify that the above proposal has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate Department and College committees:

Darius Adams, Interim Head, Dept of Forest Resources, 4/15/08

Hal Sivewser, Dean, 4/15/08

W. Thomas Adams, Head, Dept of Forest Science, 4/15/08

Steve Tesch, Head, Dept of Forest Engineering, 4/15/08

Thomas McLain, Head, Dept of Wood Science & Engineering, 4/15/08
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Abbreviated Category I Proposal to
Reorganize the College of Forestry

CIP Numbers: 140899, 143401, 030509, 030506, 030599, 030201, 310101

Current Structure and Department Names: The College of Forestry is currently organized into four academic units:

- Department of Forest Engineering
- Department of Forest Resources
- Department of Forest Science
- Department of Wood Science & Engineering

Proposed Structure and Department Names: A reorganized College will house three academic units:

- Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
- Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society
- Department of Wood Science & Engineering

A. Describe the reasons for the proposed change.

There are two primary reasons for proposing this change in organizational structure: a) the need to significantly reduce administrative expenses, and b) to better position the College for future success in a changing environment.

a) The past five years or so have been extraordinarily challenging to the financial health of the College of Forestry. At almost every turn we found that our revenue stream was incrementally diminishing while personnel costs were rising. This is a common story across the university but it has hit us harder because of our status as a state-wide public service agency. In a nutshell, Oregon Legislative Forest Research Laboratory (FRL) appropriations have been flat for several biennia excepting a modest increase in 2007. We have no tool such as raising tuition to cover the increased cost of doing business. Receipts from our other major hard funding source, the Forest Products Harvest Tax, have also been flat except for a match of the small appropriation increase. These increases fell 70% short of an OUS proposal that did not cover current faculty and staff capacity. The effects of University budget rebasing, self-funded salary increases, reductions in federal formula and special grant funding, and literally dozens of small nicks here and there have resulted in a multi-million dollar gap between College expenditures and income. Fortunately, our reserves allow for some time to resolve this imbalance and the College is actively reducing expenses and seeking to increase revenues while maintaining high quality and a proud international reputation. Reducing departmental administrative expenses and consolidating from four to three departments is
essential to that balancing effort and is expected to save as much as $380,000 per year from an FY07 baseline level.

b) The second major factor is that the world in which we and our major stakeholders operate is changing quite dramatically. These changes impact our revenues as well as strategic plans. The past 10 years have seen patterns of private forestland ownership in Oregon change significantly. Most large vertically-integrated forest-sector companies are no longer forest landowners, but many still operate manufacturing facilities. Management of federal forest-lands has become more passive and focused on fire and watershed restoration. Major concerns with climate change, forest fragmentation, land-use issues, water quality, forest health, rural economy, and increased global market competition are at the fore. Reorganization will position us to manage downsizing while creating new opportunities through program integration, and will demonstrate to the Legislature and our stakeholders that we are serious about fiscal responsibility and organizing to better meet their needs. These changes are critical to any new future investment in the College of Forestry. This is described in more detail in Section C.

B. Organizational Structure Before and After Reorganization

Figures 1 and 2 show the proposed structural change in the College. Effectively, three departments are being dissolved and two new and very different departments are reconstituted. One department, Wood Science & Engineering, is unchanged.

C. Rationale and development process for the proposed structure

Like many OSU units, the structure of the College of Forestry is a product of many decades of decisions. The College has reinvented itself many times over its 100 year history, but has seen no substantive organizational change for the past 20 years. In early 2007, the Dean and Forestry Executive Committee (FEC) began identifying alternative reorganization models. Faculty consultative groups were formed and they identified a variety of initial strategic and tactical concepts and desired outcomes in spring 2007. As a result of those efforts the FEC considered a) elimination of all departments, b) a two-school or department model and c) a three-department model. In July 2007, the Dean charged a faculty Reorganization Advisory Committee to develop multiple alternatives of a 3-unit structure using three different potential strategic foundational principles and a set of six criteria. That committee developed seven alternative models for organizing sub-disciplines, degree programs, research thrusts and outreach programs. Those were presented at a public forum and then further revised. A faculty survey was conducted to gain input from faculty, staff and students. Multiple all-college meetings were held in the fall of 2007, and we also met with key stakeholders through the FRL Advisory Committee and other venues to identify potential external concerns with different models. The FEC recommended a specific model to the Dean in early December and the Dean announced his decision to accept that recommendation in January 2008.

Current College of Forestry faculty and staff were tentatively assigned to the proposed three units and counterproposals were considered for a period of two weeks. At the end
of that time, transition leaders were appointed by the Dean to begin the process of managing change and forming new units.

The full history of the decision-making process and all of the intermediate supporting documents are found at http://www.cof.orst.edu/realignment/index.php.

The proposed structure was selected for the following reasons:

- The model creatively structures faculty expertise formerly in three departments into two new units. One unit will emphasize all aspects of active forest management from seedling through harvest or restoration following undesired disturbance and for multiple land-use objectives. These objectives will include wood production and forest management or conservation for values other than wood. The second unit addresses knowledge necessary to understand forest ecosystems and their varied interactions with human society. These missions were formerly diffuse within the existing three departments. The redistribution of faculty disciplines is expected to generate new synergies and collaborations in teaching, research and outreach.

- Maintaining the Department of Wood Science & Engineering retains its unique identity as a premier national program with high international visibility. It has a distinctly different mission, industrial and public stakeholder base and disciplinary focus than other College programs. Merging this unit would not create significant synergies with other College units.

- The selected model best achieves the strategic goals of protecting our capacity to deliver undergraduate degree programs while retaining key current strengths. It is judged to result in fewer transition challenges than other organizational alternatives.

- It reduces administrative expenses, while providing for logical groupings of disciplines that position the college well to meet current stakeholder needs and future challenges.

- Administrative savings of approximately $380,000 over a FY07 baseline are expected as a result of the reduction of the salary and OPE for 1.0 FTE Department Head, 1.0 FTE Office Manager and 2.5 FTE Office Specialist 2. Two OS2 positions have already been eliminated; one current Department Head (Forest Science) will retire July 1 and will not be replaced; and the office manager and half-time OS2 have been notified of the end of their positions and have other plans. As a result of these moves, we have a very high confidence that the projected level of savings will occur. The current Forest Resources Department is led by an interim Head who will step down once a leader of the new FERM department is selected from the current faculty of the new unit. The future leader of the FES Department will be chosen in a national search. We forecast that this leadership change will approximately break even cost wise. The exact balance is uncertain but controllable.

- This model protects our capacity to offer the current undergraduate programs and results in a more even distribution of responsibility for undergraduate and graduate degree programs among departments than is currently the case. It gives
each department a role in both undergraduate and graduate teaching and degree programs.

- Missions of the two new departments are clearly defined which will help to maintain strong program identities and stakeholder support while encouraging interdepartmental collaboration.
- It provides for a logical alignment of research cooperatives with departmental missions.
- It better positions the College for federal grant funding and for meeting natural resource agency research needs as they are evolving, especially with the integration of social science and ecology.

D. Objectives, functions and activities of the proposed units.

The missions of the proposed College departments are described by:

**Forest Engineering, Resources and Management:** Develop, communicate, and teach the science, knowledge and engineering necessary for the sustainable management of forest, land, and water resources that will achieve economic, environmental, and social objectives.

**Forest Ecosystems and Society:** This department brings together biological and social scientists to seek integrative approaches to the sustainability of forests and the services they provide.

**Wood Science & Engineering:** to advance science, engineering and business that help society produce and use renewable wood-based products that sustainably enhance human life and enable Oregon’s industry to be successful in a global market.

**Leadership:** Searches have been opened for permanent leaders for each of the two new departments. In the interim, Transition Leaders are organizing the new departments and will lead them until new Department Heads are in place.

Each new unit anticipates identifying an Associate Dept Head (ADH) from their faculty ranks. Two of the four current departments have ADH’s with differing duties. Since both of those faculty will now be in one unit it is expected that the new Department Heads will define new position descriptions for their ADH and have an open internal search for those positions.

**Impact on Undergraduate degree programs**

One goal for reorganization is to protect College capacity to deliver the current undergraduate degree programs. There are no planned changes in either the current degree requirements or in the current portfolio of course offerings resulting from reorganization. We do not see significant potential impacts on class size, student clubs or other activities as a result of reorganization. It is reasonable to expect that the curricula
will eventually change as a result of the mixing of faculty, but that will be a normal evolutionary process.

Several degree programs will be taught by faculty located in both new departments thus providing students the background to meet the growing challenges in forestry and natural resources. Over time we expect that this reorganization will have a desired effect of broadening and deepening the curriculum related to management of natural resources and specifically the BS in Natural Resources degree program.

The administration of those programs, including responsibility for assessment plans, catalog maintenance, curricular bureaucracy, etc. will change as follows:

- **BS in Forest Management** will be administered through the Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management. However, accreditation, curricular decisions and management will be made by program faculty drawn from both of the new departments. Those faculty members will be led by a Forest Management Degree Program Leader. The current faculty members responsible for this degree program are about evenly divided between the new departments.
- **BS in Recreation Resource Management** will be administered through the Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society with all curricular development and management to be the responsibility of a Forest Recreation Resources Program Faculty led by a faculty Program Leader.
- **BS in Natural Resources** program will remain unchanged from its current structure. The Program Leader will report to the Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society.
- **BS in Forest Engineering and the double BS in Forest Engineering/Civil Engineering** will be administered through the Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management. Accreditation, curricular and management decisions will be made collaboratively by Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management and by School of Civil and Construction Engineering faculty led by a faculty FE/CE program Leader.
- **BS in Forest Operations Management** will be administered through the Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management. Accreditation, curricular and management decisions will be made by Forest Operations Management Program Faculty from the two new units led by a faculty Program Leader.
- **BS in Tourism and Outdoor Leadership** will be administered through the Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society. This program will continue to be managed through the Cascades Campus and will otherwise remain unchanged.
- **BS in Wood Science & Technology** will remain unchanged.

**Impact on Undergraduate Advising**

Undergraduate advising in the professional degree programs is currently delivered by a mix of department faculty and College staff. That will not change and we do not believe that students will see any material differences in the roles of those key players for some
time. Students, however, have come to lean on some clerical staff for elements of advising assistance. With changes in staff duties, those relationships will change but should be replaced by other processes. This will be one of the transition issues to work out over the summer of 2008. The leadership and advising of the Natural Resources degree program will be unaffected by this change and will continue as currently constituted.

**Impact on Undergraduate Admissions**

There is no anticipated impact on undergraduate admissions to Forestry undergraduate degree programs. The College will continue to aggressively recruit highly qualified students into the core professional degree programs. The degree programs will remain unchanged and retain their current names.

**Impact on Graduate Degree Programs**

Graduate degree programs in the College will remain unchanged as a result of reorganization. They will likely evolve in future years, but that path is yet to be determined by the faculty. Degree requirements, admissions criteria and process, curricula and courses will continue to be the purview of the graduate faculty associated with each degree program; those are now, and will continue to be, scattered among a number of administrative units. Administrative oversight and support will be as follows:

- MS, MF (General, Silviculture), PhD in Forest Resources—Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
- MS, MF (Silviculture), PhD in Forest Science—Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society
- MS, MF, PhD in Forest Engineering—Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
- MS, MF (Forest Products), PhD in Wood Science—Department of Wood Science & Engineering
- Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Natural Resources- Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society

The specific impact of reorganization on graduate admissions will be difficult to assess for several years. There will be some restructuring of the administration of admissions in each of the new departments, but the majority of students are recruited by individual faculty. Students will continue their research programs, albeit from a different unit, and that individualized aspect of recruitment will probably not change.

**Impact on Accreditation**

The reorganization will not impact current accreditation. The professional undergraduate programs will continue to be accredited as follows:
• **Engineering Accreditation Committee of the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET-EAC)**—BS in Forest Engineering, double BS in FE/Civil Engineering.

• **Society of American Foresters (SAF)**—BS in Forest Management, BS in Recreation Resource Management, BS in Forest Engineering, Master of Forestry (General, Silviculture), BS in Forest Operations Management

• **Society of Wood Science and Technology (SWST)**—BS in Wood Science & Technology

Reorganization will be disclosed in significant change reports to those bodies. All currently accredited programs are slated for formal reaccreditation review between AY2009 and AY2011. We anticipate that most transition issues will be resolved before those evaluations.

**Course Designators**

The course designators of all courses currently offered in the College of Forestry will remain unchanged for the foreseeable future. Administration of those designators and courses will be as follows:

FOR, FE—Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
FS, SNR—Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society
WSE—Department of Wood Science & Engineering
NR—Natural Resources Interdisciplinary Degree Program

**Outreach Programs**

The outreach programs in the College that are Extension-based are led by an Associate Dean and Forestry Extension Program Leader. Campus-and field Extension faculty are, and will continue to be, integrated throughout the College. All existing outreach programs will continue as at present, as best we can see at this point. Department-based outreach efforts will evolve as the new organizations take shape.

**Research Cooperatives**

The formal Research Cooperatives and Centers in the College of Forestry will be administratively assigned as follows:

*Wood Science & Engineering:* Wood Utility Pole Research Cooperative / Oregon Wood Innovation Center

We anticipate that there will be little impact of reorganization on the operation of these cooperatives. In some cases, the mission of the new “home” department for a program may be more in line with the objectives of some cooperatives.

Assessment Plan

Success of this plan will be measured by achieving the necessary cost savings while maintaining the high quality and productivity of College programs. Those metrics will be quantified annually in the Dean’s report to the Provost. The student learning outcomes assessment plans for degree programs will be a continued gauge of success with the teaching mission. As always, exit interviews and alumni surveys will be used as information sources.

Assessment will also be made by the Oregon Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee and, informally, by the forest landowners who indirectly support faculty salaries through the harvest tax. Each new unit will consider how to best acquire input from employers and other stakeholders; current advisory groups will be maintained in the short term, but new advisory groups will be considered.

E. Changes in resources needed.

No additional recurring resources will be needed for this transition beyond minimal administrative expenses. Once the transition is completed we anticipate administrative savings through elimination of one Department Head, one Office Manager and 2.5 clerical FTE. Retirements by administrators and staff will reduce the number of necessary personnel actions required by reorganization. The College has a central business office, a College operations director and facilities manager who currently support department operations. That won’t change. We do not project any changes in space, facilities or other similar resource needs.

Faculty and other support: Reorganizing units with 30-60 years of history is traumatic and stressful. This is a significant change and will cost many faculty and staff time and energy to make this a successful transition. The faculty, staff and students actively participated in developing alternative models and in the debate about alternative organizational models. Their input was central to shaping the model that was selected. As might be expected the response to the Dean’s decision was not unanimous; no one outcome could satisfy everyone and initial responses ranged from enthusiasm to acceptance to skepticism. A key sticking point for some was a desire to see a merger of departments rather than creation of new units. The rationale for the decision was fully explained (see FAQ on transition web site) and transition planning initiated.
Since January, the new departmental faculty and staff have met on numerous occasions to develop missions, programs and structure for these new units. Search committees have been organized and the nitty-gritty details of new units are being ironed out. It is clear that the financial need for reorganization and the rationale for the chosen model are widely understood. Based on the Dean’s recent meetings with the members of each new unit the faculty and staff are moving forward and are actively working toward a successful launch of these new units. This transition will take several years, and there will be bumps in the road, but the positive engagement and attitude of the faculty, staff and students in the three departments signal a positive outcome. The Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee and various industry and landowner groups were consulted on the reorganization and are fully supportive.

**F. Funding sources**

There will be no change in the sources of funding for programs in the College of Forestry. The annual budgets of the two new units will be the sum of the essential budgets of the three existing units less anticipated administrative cost savings.

**G. Relationship of the proposed units to the institutional mission.**

1. How will the proposed program or unit support OSU's mission and goals?

The College of Forestry will continue to directly support the Land-Grant mission of the University and all OSU goals. Forests and the forest-related industrial sector will continue to be very important to Oregon for reasons of lifestyle, standard of living and economics. The Departments of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management and Forest Ecosystems and Society will support the teaching, research and outreach missions of the University in similar ways to the existing departments. Their missions will support the institutional goals and, more specifically, the strategic themes of 1) Managing natural resources that contribute to Oregon's quality of life, and growing and sustaining natural resources-based industries in the Knowledge Economy, 2) Understanding the origin, dynamics, and sustainability of the Earth and its resources, and 3) Optimizing enterprise, technological change, and innovation.

2. Describe potential positive and negative impact of the proposed change on the program(s) or unit(s) involved. Identify other OSU programs or units which may be affected, and describe the potential positive and negative impact on their mission and activities.

The positive aspects of reorganization are anticipated to be cost savings and integration of faculty and disciplinary programs in new ways. These new integrations will be inherent to each new unit, but will take time to mature. In the Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society we anticipate that this integration will facilitate new federal funding opportunities in programs that seek understandings of human activity on forest ecosystems. In the Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management we anticipate a more holistic view of active management of forests for a variety of land-use
objectives. All three departments will focus on educating the next generation of natural resources managers, scientists and leaders.

The principal negative effect of reorganization will be the time and energy required to affect significant change in cultures, long-standing practices and administrative systems. Learning new ways and building new relationships takes effort that will, in the short run, reduce some productivity. Longer term, however, new collaborations and synergies developed in the new departments will pay dividends.

We do not anticipate that any other OSU unit will be materially affected by this reorganization since there will be no immediate change in the instructional program. Individual working relationships with faculty and programs in other units should remain intact. We will take care to maintain close curricular relationships with the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Science, Liberal Arts, Engineering and Business, and close accreditation relations with the College of Engineering.

H. Long-range goals and plans for the unit.

This reorganization will help position the College of Forestry to continue as the premiere University forestry and wood science program in the US. It is part of a larger strategy to balance the College’s expenses with revenues and to reposition College programs to serve Oregon and our key stakeholders in a rapidly changing environment. The extent to which we are successful with this larger strategy will ultimately determine the long-term potential for achieving these goals and plans. The College is currently operating with a strategic plan that will be reevaluated in AY09.

Each unit is in the process of defining itself and will also spend the next year developing plans and goals.

I. Relationship of the proposed unit to other OUS programs and external constituents.

The College of Forestry is a unique unit in the OUS and offers programs that are unique in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. It enjoys a very strong national and international science and engineering reputation; our graduates are in high demand, especially in the Pacific Northwest. This reorganization will not affect other OUS programs, nor will it change our ability to deliver high quality graduates to meet the needs of Oregon’s employers.

There will a period of adjustment with some constituencies who have a long heritage with individual departments. However, change is well known to most of those stakeholders and they will adapt as long as we continue to meet their needs. Meeting those needs will continue to be of the highest priority for the College.
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**Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for the Proposed Program**

Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, the budgetary impact should be reported as zero.
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### Institution: Oregon State University

### Category I Proposal Name: Reorganization of the College of Forestry

**Institutional Operating Year:** FY09+

**Completed by:** R. Admiral

**(indicate 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th year--prepare one page for each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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### Personnel

- Faculty (Include FTE): $0
- Support Staff (Include FTE): $0
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE): $0
- Fellowships/Scholarships: $0
- FPE: Faculty Staff: $0
- GTA/GRA: $0
- Nonrecurring: $0

**Personnel Subtotal:** $0

### Other Resources

- Library/Printed: $0
- Library/Electronic: $0
- Supplies and Services: $0
- Equipment: $0
- Travel: $0
- Other Expenses: $0

**Other Resources Subtotal:** $0

### Physical Facilities

- Construction: $0
- Major Renovation: $0
- Other Expenses: $0

**Physical Facilities Subtotal:** $0

**GRAND TOTALS:** $0

**Percentage of Total**
LIASION REQUEST AND RESPONSES

From: Salwasser, Hal
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:36 AM
To: Dutson, Thayne; Adams, Ronald Lynn; Kleinsorge, Ilene - COB; Bloomer, Sherman - COS; Abbott, Mark Richard; Roper, Larry D; Clarke, Cyril; Kradjan, Wayne; Bray, Tammy; Stern, Sam; Francis, Sally K.
Subject: Category I proposal for reorganization

Colleagues,

The attached Abbreviated Category I Proposal describes a proposed reorganization of the College of Forestry from four academic departments into three. However, no degree programs or course offerings will be changed and we anticipate no impact on existing relationships with other Colleges across campus.

In accordance with the liaison criteria in the Curricular Procedures Handbook, this message serves as notification to your College of our intent to make this organizational change on July 1, 2008 or as soon as possible thereafter.

Please review the attached proposal and send your comments, concerns, or expression of support to me by April 14. Your timely response will be appreciated.

Thank you in advance for your time and input.

Hal

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Kradjan, Wayne
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:27 AM
To: Salwasser, Hal
Subject: RE:

Hal

Thank you for sharing this information. It must have been a much more painful process than that document describes. Best wishes for a successful transition.

Wayne

*******************************************************************************
Wayne A. Kradjan, Pharm. D., BCPS
Dean and Professor
Oregon State University College of Pharmacy
203 Pharmacy Building
Corvallis, OR 97331-3507

*******************************************************************************

From: Clarke, Cyril
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:54 AM
To: Salwasser, Hal
Subject: RE: Category I Proposal

Hal,
This proposal clearly is the product of a comprehensive consultative process and is well justified by both budgetary and mission imperatives. Although this change appears not to impact the College of Veterinary Medicine directly, I nevertheless support it.

Cyril

Hi Katherine,

I would like to provide you with two concerns that I have regarding this proposal.

1. The proposal mentions student involvement in the process, but I don’t clearly see the extent to which students were involved in this process. For example, the following link to comments made during this process does not distinguish which of these comments came from staff, faculty and students.

http://www.cof.orst.edu/realignment/show-comments.php?page=4

I would like to see the number of folks solicited for input in each category as well as the response rate in each category. Of most interest to me is the specific student responses (with confirmation that comments were solicited from the entire student body of the College of Forestry) to these proposed changes. I would like to see them included as part of the liaison.

2. The proposed significant cost administrative savings argument is likely not going to come to fruition, as has been demonstrated following other similar mergers/reorganizations. I believe this claim is becoming a cause for skepticism from numerous members of the faculty at large. In fact, this just may become THE topic on which most faculty focus during the discussion of this proposal in the faculty senate, following approval by the curriculum committee.

Sincerely,

Deb Pence
Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Member: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
(541) 737-7018

---College of Forestry Response:

1) Students have been heavily involved in our planning of this event for over a year. We have met with them individually and collectively at several points in the planning process, especially as we explored several organizational models. They attended our meetings and forums and have not been shy in sharing their questions and concerns. We sought their feedback in various ways but did not poll each and every one. We will not eliminate any degree programs or courses or instructors as a result of reorganization, nor do we plan to revise the curriculum. The faculty are committed to minimizing the impact of
reorganization on students, but there will be some transition, especially for graduate students. Our transition leaders are now meeting with the faculty and students who will be involved with the new units and various transition committees are working away, including one for graduate education. No one likes change and not all are happy about having to deal with it, but we, including students, are successfully moving forward.

The link you included in your comments is from archived feedback that we received in response to questions asked about some early proposed models as part of the many steps in our planning process. We did not quantify that feedback on those proposals in a way that would be meaningful at this point.

2) We are very sensitive to the issue of cost savings and have been conservative in estimating what can be achieved. Reducing administrative expenses is not an optional outcome from this reorganization. We are trying to close a $2 million gap between revenue and essential expenses and have carefully identified the savings described in our proposal. Some positions have already been eliminated and other reductions are in process. With the retirement of two department heads we have a clear view of what realistically can be achieved and when.

From: Gonzalez, Raquel  
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2008 1:19 PM  
To: Morris, Katherine 
Subject: FW: Rqs't for your College Faculty Input!

Raquel Gonzalez  
Office Manager  
Department of Rangeland Ecology and Management  
Oregon State University  
202 Strand Agriculture Hall  
Corvallis, OR 97331  
Phone: (541) 737-1616  
Fax: (541) 737-0504

From: Buckhouse, John  
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2008 11:37 AM  
To: Gonzalez, Raquel  
Cc: Borman, Mike 
Subject: RE: Rqs't for your College Faculty Input!  
Mike and Raquel,

I have no heartburn with Hal doing this. Apparently he has the degree programs covered.

John

From: Kleinsorge, Ilene - COB  
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2008 12:21 PM  
To: Matson, Susan - COB; COB - Faculty & Staff  
Subject: RE: Rqs't for your College Faculty Input!  

At the College level we have no problem with this proposal—Ilene

Ilene K. Kleinsorge, Ph.D.  
Dean  
College of Business  
Oregon State University
From: Francis, Sally K.
Sent: Sat 4/12/2008 12:39 PM
To: Salwasser, Hal
Cc: Fisk, Martin; Francis, Sally K.; Garagnani, Rosemary; Morandi, Janet K; Serewis, Helene; Strickroth, Mary
Subject: RE: Restructuring proposal

Hal,

I support your proposed reorganization. On first reading, the names chosen for the new departments are not quite as intuitive as they were previously. Our leadership team had difficulty immediately recognizing where faculty expertise and focused areas of sub-specialization will be housed. The college obviously engaged in a significant consultative process and the names are probably most meaningful to those within the College and your constituents. We wonder if the distinction will be less obvious to a student who may be shopping for a degree. Again, we trust your judgment on this.

Since the graduate degrees will remain intact at least initially, the only significant change appears to be departmental reorganization. We will need to revise our Graduate School web site, including the admissions page, to cross-walk these degree offerings within the new departmental structure. In the relative near-term, pending approval of the Category I, the graduate faculty department affiliation will need to be sorted out to reflect the new structure.

Otherwise, I see no issues and am pleased to offer my support.

Sally

College of Forestry Response: The point about names is well taken and was carefully considered by the members of the future departments. Many alternatives were considered for what will be unique departments in the US. Those names were selected by the faculty, staff and students to be the best descriptors of the nature of the future units. They resonate with students familiar with forestry and forest ecosystems, and are fine with stakeholders. The name of the graduate degrees is probably the more important issue with students and is a key to attracting new students. Those names will not change in the near future, but will likely evolve with time.

From: Thomas G. Dietterich [mailto:tgd@eecs.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2008 5:04 PM
To: Hall, Jennifer; Morris, Katherine
Subject: RE: [eecs-faculty] FW: Rqs't for your College Faculty Input!

This looks ok to me. I have collaborations with some of these folks, but that will not be affected. Also, the connection with COE via the FE/Civil Engineering double major is unaffected.
--Tom

Thomas G. Dietterich Voice: 541-737-5559
School of EECS FAX: 541-737-1300
1148 Kelley Engineering Center URL: http://eecs.oregonstate.edu/~tgd
Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-5501

From: Karow, Russell
Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2008 7:53 PM
To: Morris, Katherine
Subject: reorg plan

Katherine,

I quickly reviewed the plan and am supportive, but as always, the devil is in the details.
When Crop Science and Soil Science merged in 1990 there was little immediate cost savings but handling of finances and personnel has changed significantly over the past 18 years, so this may work.

Russ Karow, Head
CSS

---

From: Tara Bevandich [mailto:bevandit@science.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2008 4:27 PM
To: Morris, Katherine
Subject: FW: category I proposal

Hi Katherine,
Thanks for the opportunity to review the Forestry Reorganization plan. I sent this out to our Zoology Faculty. Barb Taylor, Zoology Executive Committee and Joe Beatty, Interim Chair agree that this reorganization is a good plan. Thank you.
Tara

From: Barbara Taylor [mailto:taylorb@science.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2008 3:28 PM
To: ‘Tara Bevandich’
Cc: ‘Joe Beatty’
Subject: category I proposal

Hi Tara,

I wanted to respond to the Cat I proposal about the reorganization of the College of Forestry. It seems to me that this is a good plan and I have no objections to the proposal.
Barb

Barbara J. Taylor
Professor
Department of Zoology
Director, Molecular and Cellular Biology Graduate Program
Oregon State University
Corvallis OR 97331

Phone: 541 737-5344
Fax: 541 737-0501
taylorb@science.oregonstate.edu

Tom,

We talked about the proposal at faculty meeting yesterday and the only comment we would like to make is that we would expect to be consulted on any future curricular changes that affect either our majors or majors in the re-constituted College of Forestry who intend to incorporate some of our courses into their degree programs.
Otherwise, it we have no other concerns, and extend our best wishes for the transition to a more streamlined and effective College.

Sally K. Gallagher
Professor of Sociology and Chair

---
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Thanks Stephen for including Cascades in the communication process. Diana Sloane and I have reviewed the proposal. Ron Reuter and Kreg Lindberg have confirmed that the proposal does not present concerns to their respective programs at Cascades. Net, Cascades has been consulted and does not have concerns. marla

Diana and Marla, the attached Abbreviated Category I Proposal describes a proposed reorganization of the College of Forestry from four academic departments into three. However, no degree programs or course offerings will be changed and we anticipate no impact on existing relationships with other Colleges on the Corvallis campus or with the Cascades Campus.

In accordance with the liaison criteria in the Curricular Procedures Handbook, this message serves as notification to you of our intent to make this organizational change on July 1, 2008 or as soon as possible thereafter.

Please review the attached proposal and send your comments, concerns, or expression of support to me by May 6. I would also appreciate you copying Gina Shellhammer who will make sure the appropriate Faculty Senate Committees receive your response prior to their May meetings.

Thank you in advance for your time and input.

Steve