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1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

This is a consolidation of six individual Masters of Science Programs, Conservation Social Sciences, Fisheries Resources, Forest Resources, Forest Products, Rangeland Ecology and Management, and Wildlife Resources into one integrated and jointly managed program. The purpose is to increase program management effectiveness, including meeting the recommended minimum standard of graduating at least 10 students per year; create a higher quality and potentially more interdisciplinary educational environment for the graduate students; align our program with the US Department of Education’s Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP 2000); and continue to position the University of Idaho natural resources educational mission for a successful future.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.).

This consolidated Master’s of Science Degree in Natural Resources builds upon the recommendations of the recently completed Yardley Report concerning University of Idaho graduate programs and addresses the metrics identified during the program prioritization process for maintaining sustainable and viable graduate programs as well as the university adopted Program Prioritization Criteria. This proposed graduate program is clearly central to our mission. Cost effectiveness gains would occur in the areas of program assessment, credit hour production, and program administration. Internal and external demands exist and are likely to grow over the next decade. This change should allow additional faculty time to be redirected toward our professional and doctoral programs or increasing the number of students enrolled in this program. We expect our program size to remain stable with room for modest growth and the quality of the student experience has the potential to be improved via increased interdisciplinary aspects of the proposed program and increased dialogue among and between faculty and graduate students. The proposed change is designed to continue to promote synergies between the College of Natural Resources (CNR) and Law as well as between CNR’s graduate academic program and other related social and biophysical science and land resource/management programs at the University of Idaho. Furthermore, the proposed consolidated degree continues to reflect the state’s changing natural resource needs and demands, and it will provide Idaho graduates for the state, national, and international workforce in the area of natural resource and conservation sciences.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

The quality of this consolidated program will be insured by continued annual assessment and regular multi-year external reviews of the program and its options. Additionally, an Advisory Committee of practicing scientists and professionals will be engaged in regular curriculum reviews and processes to further develop CNR’s long standing nationally known natural resource and conservation programs.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.
This graduate programming will continue to build upon and evolve cooperative efforts with Washington State University, the University of Montana and other outstanding natural resource graduate programs throughout the nation, especially as we enhance our sharing of virtual graduate courses and programming. Inside Idaho we will continue to cooperate with related programs and scientists at Idaho’s state and private institutions of higher education. Our recent efforts to update our memorandums of understanding with federal and state land management, natural resource, and environmental agencies as well as collaboratives with private and non-profit organizations will also add to the strength of this program.

Because graduate natural resources and forestry education programming is central to the University of Idaho’s mission and we have always had responsibility for delivery of these programs throughout the state, there are no other graduate programs in this specific area at our other state public institutions.

Recent composite enrollments for the six Master's Programs at the University of Idaho being consolidated into one are shown in the table below. The decline in the number of MS graduates is offset in part CNR's increasing number of graduates in our PhD Natural Resources Program, and our Master's of Natural Resources Professional Degree Program. This is a planned strategy with the long term goal of having three outstanding graduate natural resource and conservation programs all targeting different student markets and fulfilling different needs in the workforce (natural resource practicing professionals, scientists, and researchers).

Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years. Note enrollment data includes both full and part time graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI (Full &amp; Part-time)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>BS; MS; PhD</td>
<td>Within the larger discipline classification area (CIP 2000) of Natural Resources and Conservation we will continue to offer the following specializations: Conservation Social Sciences, Ecology and Conservation Biology, Fisheries Resources, Forest Products, Forest Resources, Range Ecology and Management, Resource Recreation and Tourism, Wildlife Resources.</td>
<td>All of these specializations are offered at the BS level at UI as independent academic programs and the opportunity to pursue doing a science (MS) or more practice oriented degree (MNR) will be maintained at the Master’s level and the consolidated PhD will be retained. Additionally, emerging topic areas such as policy sciences and law, land use planning and management, ecosystem services, human ecology, fire ecology, and conservation biology are likely to evolve as elements of our graduate program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The proposed change retains an area central to the University of Idaho’s mission—natural resources and forestry education. It will do it more effectively, while continuing to promote individualized programming for MS students and position the program to be flexible to react to a changing future. It does not duplicate existing graduate programs elsewhere in the state. It also provides an opportunity to meet an existing demand and positions the graduate programming in Natural Resources to expand into directions of identified interest and where existing faculty expertise can be further capitalized upon.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.
   Yes _____ No  X___

   If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

These changes are motivated by CNR’s need to continue to transform its graduate level academic programming to reflect changes in natural resources and associated sub-fields, and the faculty's desire to strengthen its science-based programs. Clearly, the existing economic situation has caused us to immediately address the need to be more cost effective and recent changes in the college’s strategic plan provide guidance to re-evaluate our graduate programming in terms of quality, productivity, relevance to workforce demands and emerging directions in natural resources.
8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reallocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated – New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Nature of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recurring *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-recurring **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become part of the base.
**Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

**Less Tangible Benefits:**
The enhanced consolidated graduate degree program at the Master’s of Science level will result in the production of new synergy among existing Departments and Program Areas by continuing processes of dialogue among faculties. It is likely to result in course redevelopment, increased credit hour production per FTE, and a reduction in total time allocated to MS assessment activities. This released time will become available to invest in our professional and PhD programs as recommended by Yardley. This effort also continues the movement within the College of Natural Resources to become more interdisciplinary and reflects the need of our graduates to address complex natural resource problems that involve biophysical and human systems.
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committees: College standing groups defined by by-laws as being normally involved in such processes:

CNR Leadership Council (Consensus agreement): Pam Bell, Jo Ellen Force, Tom Gorman, Jim Gosz, Troy Hall, Steve Hollenhorst, Karen Lauchbaugh, Nancy Matthews, Bill McLaughlin, Kerry Reese, and Larry Young to support the idea of a single MS degree program and having the Dean develop the initial draft for department review. (January 21, 2009)

CNR Dean drafts the Initial NOI: After holding a series of sessions with each departmental faculty an NOI was drafted attempting to reflect ideas and concerns brought forward in the Departmental sessions. (January 27, 2009)

CNR Departmental Faculty: Faculty In the Departments of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Forest Products, Forest Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management and Conservation Social Sciences discussed the issues and empowered their representative to the CNR Curriculum Committee to present ideas on their behalf. (Week of January 26th)

CNR Curriculum Committee: Janet Rachlow, chair, Karen Launchbaugh (substitute for Lee Vierling), David Roon, Larry Young (substitute for Troy Hall), Fran Wagner, Mike Whiteman, Anthony Davis (substitute for Penny Morgan). Also present were Charles Tibbals, academic publications editor, Registrar’s Office, and Valarie Roberts, Assistant to the Dean, College of Graduate Studies. (January 31, 2009) The Committee voted to take an amended version back to their Departmental faculties for further discussion and report back to the Committee Chair by February 4, have an e-mail vote on a final version, and report to the Dean by February 6. Committee Members reported back and conducted their vote on a final version of the NOI. Monday, February 9 the Dean was sent an e-mail from the Committee Chair reporting a unanimous vote by the committee on the revised NOI. On February 9 the NOI was placed on the website and an email sent to all CNR faculty members as required.

CNR By-Laws Waiting Period (2/09 – 2/13): The proposed change was posed on the CNR website and all faculty sent an e-mail on February 9. After five working days only a single faculty member called for additional discussion and according to our by-laws in absence of five faculty members’ dissent within five days of notice the recommendations of the CNR Curriculum are forwarded to the UI Curriculum Committee and on February 17 it was forwarded to the Graduate School and the Provost Office.

Program/Degree: Master of Science in Natural Resources.

Discussion: Other discussion opportunities provided.

CNR Leadership: On January 21, 2009, Dean Bill McLaughlin led the college leadership in a discussion about the possible consolidation of six individual Masters of Science Programs majors into one Master of Science in Natural Resources. The consensus was that the dean meet with department
faculty, obtain input from masters students and draft a NOI for the CNR Curriculum Committee to consider.

CNR Department Faculty Discussion with Dean: Between January 21 and 23, 2009, the dean met and obtained input from department faculty. There was general agreement with the proposed consolidation. The Dean used these inputs to draft a NOI and move it forward to Department Heads the CNR Curriculum Committee Chairperson.

CNR Masters’ Students: On January 29, Mike Whiteman met with masters’ students to obtain their input. They expressed mild concern that a single master’s program may be less attractive to potential students, and there might be possible confusion between the Master of Natural Resources and a Master of Science in Natural Resources. Additionally, e-mail input was sought and several students responded. Some were supportive and felt it would have positive impacts and others were concerned about the loss of program identity.

Alumni Board of Trustees: On January 29, we distributed an e-mail to our Alumni Board of Trustees where we explained the changes and solicited any concerns that they might have. We also provided them with a copy of Presidents Update and Progress Report.

From: Rachlow, Janet
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 4:26 PM
To: McLaughlin, William
Cc: Matthews, Nancy
Subject: result of vote on NOI

Bill,
The Curriculum Committee voted unanimously to pass the NOI for consolidation of the 6 MS degrees in CNR.

Committee Members representing each Department or Program are:

Troy Hall (Conservation Social Sciences) Penny Morgan (Forest Resources) Janet Rachlow (Fish and Wildlife Resources), Chair David Roon (Ecology and Conservation Biology) Lee Vierling (Rangeland Ecology and Management) Fran Wagner (Forest Products)

Thanks, Janet
Dr. Janet Rachlow
Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources
P.O. Box 441136
Moscow, ID 83844-1136
phone: 208-885-9328
fax: 208-885-9080
CNR Curriculum Committee

January 31, 2009

Present: Janet Rachlow, chair, Karen Launchbaugh (sub. for Lee Vierling), David Roon, Larry Young (sub. for Troy Hall), Fran Wagner, Mike Whiteman, Anthony Davis (sub. for Penny Morgan).

Also present: Charles Tibbals, academic publications editor, Registrar’s Office, and Valarie Roberts, Assistant to the Dean, College of Graduate Studies

Masters - NOI Discussion

The draft NOI proposal prepared by Bill McLaughlin to combine the college’s seven masters into one was discussed.

Objections voiced by department faculties included: Options not already included in the college should not be added without further deliberations. A Master of Science in Natural Resources is somewhat confusing compared to MNR, which is more of a professional degree. A Master of Science without options would provide more flexibility and would provide more flexibility and would be a strong program across the college. Programs with fewer than ten students are protected from elimination. There is a danger in moving to a common program but, it was noted, that has not happened with the college’s PhD. Most prefer to have the program listed or included in the title; with the exception of fisheries and wildlife, that would not discourage students from coming.

The college’s PhD is a Dr. of Philosophy with a major in natural resources. The proposed change to the CNR masters would create a Master of Science with a major in natural resources.

Valerie noted that it is not uncommon to have a college-wide doctoral program, e.g. a sports physiologist with a College of Education degree; they describe their background with their list of publications and letters of reference. It was noted that a master degree is different and for many is a terminal degree.

A question was raised about what specialization term could be used without SBOE approval. Charles said “concentration” is used most commonly and Karen indicated REM has used “Career Track” to describe a focus area. Neither will show up on an official transcript.

Next Steps

MSP (Larry Young; Fran Wagner): Put forward these two approaches that do the following:

- MS degree with a major in natural resources with no specified options
- MS degree with major in natural resources with six specified options that are being consolidated
- A clear explanation of the reasoning behind those two approaches be provided and departments have an opportunity to react to those and this or another NOI as modified.

Anthony agreed to write the rational for master with no options and Janet agreed to write the master with options.

MSP (Rachlow, Wagner): After discussion with respective departments that we forward the recommended modifications to the dean.
The process was discussed:
1) Return to dean for revision with recommendations
2) Dean returns to committee
3) Committee discusses and circulates to faculty for 5 days
4) If no dissenting vote from 5 faculty, then it will forward to UCC

Charles explained the university’s stand. According to legal counsel there is no veto in this process. Items may be forwarded to SBOE in two ways:

- The president can send something to SBOE. Even if there is no support in the college, with UCC and Faculty Council, the proposal may be forwarded anyway.
- The faculty can circumvent the president and forward items to SBOE

It is possible that retaining options may not appear to the SBOE as enough of a change. And, if the process in the college doesn’t move swiftly it is possible changes will be made for us. Representatives from the departments were asked to caucus and get a consensus or email vote from their faculty. The default position needs to be clarified to the faculty.

A vote of the committee was taken:
1. Master of Science, no options (4 in favor; Larry unknown)
2. Master of Science with 6 existing majors as options (1 in favor; Larry unknown)

MSP (Launchbaugh, Wagner): The recommendation of these two options from the Curriculum Committee favors a single Master of Natural Resources degree without options. A footnote and rationale will be included.

Janet and Anthony will redraft the NOI today, forward the proposal to faculty today, meet Tuesday, February 3, or Wednesday, February 4, and forward the committee’s recommendations to the dean by the end of the week.

There was a consensus that “sustainable” and other options that were added should be removed.

**Bachelor of Science for Range Livestock**

MSP (Launchbaugh): That the NOI with amendments that drops the Bachelors of Science for range livestock.

To approve the NOI with amendments that drops the Bachelors of Science I range livestock.

Vote: unanimous vote
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee:  Graduate Council

Program/Degree:  Consolidation of Forest Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management, Conservation Social Sciences, Forest Products, and Fish and Wildlife Resources
  To Master of Science in Natural Resources

Discussion:

Janet Rachlow presented on behalf of the CNR College Curriculum Committee. Dean McLaughlin was also present to address questions.

Dr. Rachlow indicated that all the majors within the college would be collapsed into the M.S. Natural Resources. No options or emphasis areas are included in the name of the degree. This concept parallels the college-wide PH.D. degree in Natural Resources.

In CNR, the department faculty voices their opinions to their representative to the College Curriculum Committee and then committee acts on their behalf so there are no specific department votes reported. The issue is then posted on the college website and asks faculty to indicate any concerns. In the absence of five faculty members dissenting within five days of the note, the NOI is considered approved. It was reported that there was no overwhelming opposition to the NOI from the department faculty.

With this NOI approved, the College degrees would be the Master of Natural Science, Master of Science, Ph.D. all in Natural Resources.

Dean McLaughlin indicated that the degree can all be the same and the coursework can reflect the areas of specialty or interdisciplinary. Because the Study Plan indicates the student’s direction, the direction of the program can be determined there.

The college has 58 faculty.

With consolidation, is there a common core? Dean McLaughlin indicated that this is the long-term discussion and goal. Instead of six sets of learning outcomes, there will be one set to be discussed.

Question was asked if the need to consolidate was based on low numbers in each program and if combining them would produce stronger numbers. Master of Science degrees in the six areas have declined from 40 in 2004 to 25 in 2008. The following chart shows a more detailed breakdown:
Consolidation of CNR programs
Page 2
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNR MS Majors</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Ecology and Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Master of Natural Resource degree is an expanding on-line program for professionals.

Question was asked if students will be less likely to come here if the program isn’t individually identified. The response was that the Fish and Wildlife students and department may miss the name recognition, especially in Idaho, but do not oppose the consolidation.

Vote: __13___In Favor
      ___0__Opposed
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/02/09

Absent: Nancy Krogh, Garrett Holbrook.
Others Present: Margrit Von Braun, John Foltz, Bill Woolston, Mark Hoversten, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Consolidate the following Master of Science major into a combined major in Natural Resources: Conservation Social Sciences; Fishery Resources; Forest Resources; Forest Products; Rangeland Ecology and Management; and Wildlife Resources.

Discussion:

UCC-09-102  College of Natural Resources
The committee reviewed the proposed Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Natural Resources to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) majors in Conservation Social Sciences; Fishery Resources; Forest Resources; Forest Products; Rangeland Ecology and Management; and Wildlife Resources. The proposed NOI also seeks to create a consolidated Master of Science major in Natural Resources. Committee chair Dacey asked what the difference is between the M.N.R. program and the M.S. program. Committee member Marshall indicated that the M.N.R. program is intended mostly for off-campus students and does not contain a research requirement. Committee member Machleidt voiced concern over the varying subjects all being housed under one major. Marshall noted that proposed consolidated M.S. program would then be in line with the existing Ph.D. program and would hopefully encourage more cross-department work within the college. Machleidt noted that there would be very little cost savings from this reorganization. Committee member Wells remarked that this NOI made sense to him from an administrative and academic perspective. The committee Approved the proposed NOI 11 for and 0 against, and will forward the proposed NOI to Faculty Council for review.

Vote: Approved – 11 For, 0 Against