

Model 3 Prime: Primary Use (w/broader mgt focus – CFAC Recommendation)

	A Wood Science & Engineering	B Forest Operations, Management, and Engineering <small>(emphasis on management, uses and sciences)</small>	C Forest Resources Sciences and Services, <small>(Emphasis on forest resource uses and science)</small>
Research Focus	Biodeterioration, Wood Protection & Product Durability Composite Materials Forest Products Business & Marketing Timber Engineering & Structural Design Wood Anatomy & Quality Wood and Adhesives Chemistry Wood Products Processing Timber Harvesting (Wood Quality Processing)	Harvesting process engineering Transportation system design and mgmt Forest operations analysis and production planning Landscape planning and harvest scheduling Precision forestry Forestry workforce development and safety Silviculture & Forest Regeneration Forest Econ Policy & Planning (commodity based) Forest Measurement Growth & Yield (3) Watershed management and soils research to support forest operations, ie road and harvest related erosion, off road soil compaction. Forest restoration treatments	Hydrological sciences Forest Meas., Remote Sensing & GIS (3) Forest Econ, Policy & Planning (4) Forest Social Science Natural Resources Ed & Ext Forest Restoration Ecology (6) Forestry/Wildlife (6) Forest Ecology Forest Genetics Tree Physiology Forest Health (6) Global Change/Biogeochemistry Statistics Forest Soils(2,4) Forest Genetics (applied) (1)
Co-ops	Wood Utility Pole	Hardwood Silviculture Nursery Technology NW Tree Improvement Vegetation Management Watershed Research (related to operations) CIPS	PNW Tree Improvement Research Tree Biosafety and Genomics Watersheds Swiss Needle Cast
Campus-based Extension Programs	FP Manufacturing FP Marketing and Business Mgt OWIC	Timber Harvesting Forest Taxation & Estate Planning Watershed Management (for OPNS)	Watershed Management Forest Health Sustainable Living (7)
Initial Curricula Home (5)	BS in Wood Science and Technology	BS in Forest Engineering Double BS degree program in FE/CE BS in Forest Operations Management BS in Forest Management, some options Including silviculture, restoration, fuels management	BS in Recreation Resources Mgt BS in Natural Resources BS in Tourism and Outdoor Leadership

Notes:

1. Applied Genetics rather than more basic science. Not sure if splitting applied from basic is practical?
2. Soils should be separated from silviculture for this exercise.
3. The distinctions between basic and applied research in precision forestry/mensuration/remote sensing are not always clear. Hence, there is an open question as to whether Unit B or C is best for these focus areas
4. Could go to any unit depending on specific focus.
5. Graduate degrees are not shown since they will likely change depending on the resulting organizational structure and are less connected to accreditation actions.
6. These program areas could be placed in either Unit B or C depending on whether they had a stronger management or science bent
7. Could go to A or C depending on specific focus.

Model 3 Prime: Primary Use (w/broader mgt focus)

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Better balance between units with respect to number of programs, and probably staff than Models 1, 1' or 2.</p> <p>Strong identity for forest management.</p> <p>Broadens scope for forest operations focus.</p> <p>May foster interdisciplinarity between units and curricular interchanges necessary to handle teaching needs.</p> <p>Compared to Model 3 (regular), may reduce image of brown versus green, especially because of restoration focus in Unit B.</p> <p>May be useful for competing for large interdisciplinary (e.g., combining physical and social sciences) federal and international research grants given that wide range of expertise would be “under one roof,” especially in Department C.</p> <p>May facilitate a better fit for some Coops</p>	<p>Diversity in unit C may challenge undergraduate program delivery?</p> <p>Diffuse identity and mission in Department C, especially for students and stakeholders given the wide range of research foci of faculty, programs, and other students. This may exacerbate an existing concern.</p>

Comments

Broadens domain of forest operations to include all forest uses where management can contribute to goals. Could result in some redefinition of undergraduate programs toward a stronger science base—that could be good or not.

It is not clear whether the term “restoration” is more descriptive than “forest management”. The former presumes that restoration of forests to some different state is the central focus. The latter more broadly addresses a range of actions to be taken that will achieve a set of long-term objectives, including restoration.

Some RAC members feel that this model may promote move to administer curricula at college level rather than at department. Uncertain how that would work and what consequences ensue.

Most logical division of curricula.

May be more efficient to have Extension people in two Departments?

Will highlight need for consistency in requirements and demands for graduate degrees, especially in Department C. Given the wide range of research and disciplines, some students may feel that their fellow students’ Ph.D. (for example) degrees were less (or more) rigorous than their own. This is already a problem voiced by several recent FR graduates and could only worsen as this department broadens even more.

We should consider more interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate degree programs. We have a critical mass of faculty (especially in FS and across campus) that focus on conservation biology and related topics. Perhaps Unit C could be a good fit for developing an UG program initiative in this area? This could help, in part, balance curricula.

Potential challenge with parity in Unit C P&T process. Some social science faculty currently in FR, for example, often teach 4-6 courses / year and RFP’s / grants in this field are often more applied in focus and offer less than \$100K funding per project. How would these faculty members be evaluated compared to those who teach much less (if at all), focus on basic science, and have more resources to attract larger grants?

For options / courses that would be split between units (e.g., some FM courses / foci in Unit B, some in Unit C), need to address funding models and numbering for courses. For example, some current courses cross-listed as both FE and FOR receive different funding, yet they are the same course.

Will cause current FS faculty to teach undergraduate courses in Unit C. This would be good because undergraduates would be able to learn new skills from experts in these fields. It could also be bad, however, because it may reduce faculty focus on research and attracting large grants, and may force some faculty who may be excellent researchers, but fair teachers to redirect their focus and strengths.

Unit C encourages interdisciplinary research and the potential for attracting massive multi-disciplinary (e.g., combine social and physical sciences) and multi-agency project grants (e.g., multiple universities), which is good. A tradeoff, however, is that this unit would need more administrative support to administer these large and complex projects.

Many of the same attributes as Model 3 (e.g. Balanced in numbers across education, research focus, coops, and extension. May have smaller transaction costs to implement (at least in terms of administrative structure) because departmental administration would be similar to what is in place now. Splits current Forest Management degree across departments and, hence, may have higher transaction costs in terms of curriculum management.) But ideological split is less pronounced.