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Proposal for Academic Program Name Change

Institution: Oregon State University
College/School: Agricultural Sciences
Department/Program: Fisheries and Wildlife

1. Program Description
   a. Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP): 03.0101

   b. Brief overview (1-2 paragraphs) of the proposed program, including its disciplinary foundations and connections; program objectives; programmatic focus; degree, certificate, minor, and concentrations offered.

   We propose to change our name from the “Department of Fisheries and Wildlife” to the “Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology” to better represent to the university, students and public the nature of our mission. Across the country, departments such as ours were created to train students to manage the harvest of game and commercial species. Relatively speaking, the world and the Oregon of yesterday were much richer in fish and wildlife resources. Now, the world and Oregon are rapidly deteriorating because of high human population growth rates, and its attendant problems. Over the last 30 years, we have adapted our research and educational directions to meet these challenges and we have now developed a national and international reputation for work on vertebrate species that are disappearing from the ocean, old growth forests, urban, agricultural, and rangeland land and riverscapes. Virtually all of our faculty are involved in research on species of special interest or concern or at risk of extinction, including: (1) whales, leatherback turtles, and groundfishes in the ocean; (2) marbled murrelets, spotted owls, and red tree voles in old growth forests; (3) amphibians at risk of extinction but needing habitat in agricultural landscapes; (5) endangered suckers of Upper Klamath Lake; (4) diminishing runs of Oregon salmonids; and (5) pygmy rabbits, sage-grouse, and Lahonton cutthroat trout in eastside arid landscapes. Many of our faculty have or presently serve on federal and state teams, task forces and panels involved in conservation issues, like Endangered Species Act recovery planning. This is the short list, but enough to tell you who we are. We are not your father’s Fisheries and Wildlife Department.

   We have faculty who use concepts of metapopulation and population genetic structure in their work, and we have people involved with GIS technology to integrate information across land, river and seascapes. GIS technology can be used for developing conservation strategies using interactive maps. For example, our faculty developed the Willamette River Atlas as a means of exploring alternative future states for the planning of the Willamette Valley. Students are exposed to the quantitative tools of demography, as well as qualitative mathematical modeling of community interactions. As a result, our graduate students and faculty are actively involved with the cutting edge areas of biological assessments central to understanding trends and resource status at local, regional, national, and international levels of geographical resolution. Our students have access to hands-on learning at the Hatfield Marine Science Center and the Oregon Hatchery Research Center. The latter is not just a place to learn about hatcheries, but a place that tests important questions about evolution, adaptation, genetics, and ecology and where the question always remains that a judicious use of any tool must always be tested and challenged.
The lessons we learn from research are extended to the students in the classroom. We offer a B.S. degree in Fisheries and Wildlife Science, M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Fisheries Science or Wildlife Sciences and a graduate certificate in Fisheries Management. The students in these programs are encouraged to think more about management of ecological communities, rather than single, targeted species. Students learn how abundance, distribution, and genetic structure influence species persistence. In short, the principles and techniques of Conservation Biology are central to our curriculum.

There is a growing awareness of the importance of this field. The world needs more conservation biologists. Within the past two years, both the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have recast their mission towards biodiversity, ecological community management, and conservation. We specifically recruit and train the type of employee they seek. Likewise, there is a growing demand for our students from conservation oriented NGO’s and private consulting firms. Youth are very attracted to this field because they sense its urgency and importance to the planet. Already five well recognized Fish and Wildlife programs, U.C. Davis, University of Florida, University of Minnesota, Colorado State University, and New Mexico State University, have added “Conservation” or “Conservation Biology” to their names. We should do likewise, as it announces that our department will retain its leadership at the forefront of the discipline. To remain the best, we have to recruit with the best.

c. Course of study – proposed curriculum, including course numbers, titles, and credit hours.
Not applicable to name change proposal—We are not proposing to change the curriculum or name of any of the degrees, minors or certificates we offer.

d. Manner in which the program will be delivered, including program location (if offered outside of the main campus), course scheduling, and the use of technology (for both on-campus and off-campus delivery).
We offer all of our degrees on campus and have 31 undergraduate and 12 graduate classes developed for on-line delivery. Starting Fall 2009 we began to offer our B.S. on-line and we currently offer our graduate certificate in Fisheries Management on-line. We also offer an intensive field-based term of study at Hatfield Marine Science Center in the fall and our some courses are also taught for the Agricultural Program at Eastern Oregon University and on the Cascades Campus.

e. Ways in which the program will seek to assure quality, access, and diversity.
Academic program quality is assured with our Learner Outcome Assessment plan (http://fw.oregonstate.edu/pdfs/FWDraftAssessmentPlan.pdf) for our B.S. degree and for our graduate students by our Annual Graduate Student Assessment of progress (http://fw.oregonstate.edu/Graduate%20Information/annual_evaluation.htm). We also conduct a statistical survey of all graduates every three years. The 2009 survey is available at: http://fw.oregonstate.edu/pdfs/Surveyofgraduates09report.pdf. Quality of our research program is assured by the number of publications in national and international journals and competitive grants that faculty and students produce. The Chronicle of Higher Education most recent survey of Ph.D. program productivity (http://chronicle.com/stats/productivity/) ranked our Wildlife Science Program number one in the nation and our Fisheries Science program
number two in the nation. The Oregon University System only had one other number-one-ranked program (UO School of Psychology) and no other number-two-ranked programs.

We have no restrictions on our B.S. majors and our recent addition of a BS degree on-line substantially increases access to that program (~75 new majors the first term). Access to our graduate degrees is restricted by the number of students we can support on Graduate Research Assistantships or Graduate Teaching Assistantships; no students are accepted without some form of support. Access to graduate classes is also enhanced by our on-line classes.

Diversity is major issue for us because the Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology professions have historically been staffed predominately by white males. By the end of the 09-10 academic year our department will have a diversity and community enhancement plan. However, we have been actively engaged in enhancing diversity for many years. Nine of our last 15 faculty hires have been women and/or minorities. One of our most recent hires under the Tenured Faculty Diversity Initiative will specifically work on diversity recruitment and retention as part of her position. We have a 2+2 program agreement with Tuskegee University that has significantly increased the number of Black Americans in our program. Furthermore, we have developed an endowed diversity-based scholarship and our block grant for the Oregon Laurels Scholarships designates 50% of those funds to go to underrepresented populations.

f. Anticipated fall term headcount and FTE enrollment over each of the next five years.
The following data are based on an average of the past 5 years with the exception of AY09, which is actual data; we have no reason to anticipate significant changes in enrollments in our programs with the exception of an increase in our on-line BS. We enrolled approximately 75 majors for our on-line program during the first term, but have no way to predict how large it could grow. Our only frame of reference is the number of students in our on-campus BS relative to the on-campus enrollment of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resources degrees, which are also offered on-line. Based on those relative proportions, we might anticipate that our on-line enrollment might increase to approximately 200 majors. Data for M.S. degrees (Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science) and Ph.D. degrees (Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science) are combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>AY09-10</th>
<th>AY10-11</th>
<th>AY11-12</th>
<th>AY12-13</th>
<th>AY13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


g. Expected degrees/certificates produced over the next five years.
The following data are based on an average of the past 5 years with the exception of AY09, which is actual data; we have no reason to anticipate significant changes in degrees conferred with the exception of our BS degree on-line (see 1g). Data for M.S. degrees (Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science) and Ph.D. degrees (Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science) are combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>AY09-10</th>
<th>AY10-11</th>
<th>AY11-12</th>
<th>AY12-13</th>
<th>AY13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Characteristics of students to be served (resident/nonresident/international; traditional/nontraditional; full-time/part-time; etc.)

The following data characterize our current student body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Nonresidents</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Older than 25 years</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrads</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Adequacy and quality of faculty delivering the program.
See statement in 1e above about our national rankings. Furthermore, our program underwent a comprehensive 10-year review in 2007 and received very high marks for our research, teaching, and outreach. Over 95% of our classes are taught by tenure-track faculty members or courtesy faculty; we use very few instructors to deliver our academic programs.

j. Faculty resources – full-time, part-time, adjunct.
The following faculty are tenure-track, research, courtesy or adjunct faculty that currently conduct research, teach graduate and undergraduate classes, or advise graduate students in our M.S. and Ph.D. Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science programs. Vita for faculty members are available upon request.

**Department of Fisheries and Wildlife faculty that conduct research, teach undergraduate or graduate classes and advise graduate students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Anthony</th>
<th>Wildlife ecology, population analysis, environmental contaminants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Professor of Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader, Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Scott Baker</th>
<th>Molecular ecology of marine mammals, historical demography and population dynamics of whales, molecular taxonomy, conservation genetics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of The Marine Mammal Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Banks</th>
<th>Genetic characterization of natural populations, Fishery subjects, aquacultural species.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Cooperative Institute of Marine Resources Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerri Bartholomew</th>
<th>Salmon diseases, fish parasites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Microbiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew Betts</th>
<th>Forest wildlife, landscape ecology.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor of Forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ecosystems and Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George Boehlert</th>
<th>Fisheries oceanography, ecology of early life history stages in fishes, ecology of isolated oceanic islands and seamounts, fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Hatfield Marine Science Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Burnett</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra DeBano</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Dugger</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Dugger</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Dumbald</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Dunham</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ebersole</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Daniel Edge</td>
<td>Department Head and Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Epps</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Flintcroft</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Jesse Ford</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Forsman</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Garcia</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Giannisco</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Gregory</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Gervais</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Haig</td>
<td>Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS Forest and Range Ecosystem Science Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Heppell</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selina Heppell</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Horning</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Herlihy</td>
<td>Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri Johnson</td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Kennedy</td>
<td>Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kent</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Microbiology and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lackey</td>
<td>Courtesy Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Landers</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Langdon</td>
<td>Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Markle</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Mate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor of Wildlife</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jessica Miller</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Noakes</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordon Reeves</strong></td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W. Douglas Robinson</strong></td>
<td>Associate Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel Roby</strong></td>
<td>Courtesy Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dan Rosenberg</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phillipe Rossignol</strong></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Sampson</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dana Sanchez</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Wildlife and Extension Wildlife Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carl Schreck</strong></td>
<td>Courtesy Professor of Fisheries Leader, Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian Sidlauskas</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Smith</strong></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilbert Sylvia</strong></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Agricultural and Resource Economics Superintendent, Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Thompson</strong></td>
<td>Courtesy Assistant Professor of Fisheries National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
k. Other staff.
The department has over 20 Faculty Research Assistants, 1 Head Advisor, 1 Internship Coordinator/DE Advisor, 1 Office Manager, 2 Office Specialists, 1 Grants and Contracts Technician, 2 IT support staff, 1 facilities manager/aquaculturist.

l. Facilities, library, and other resources.
Not applicable to name change proposal.

m. Anticipated start date.
As soon as approved.

2. Relationship to Mission and Goals
a. Manner in which the proposed program supports the institution’s mission and goals for access; student learning; research, and/or scholarly work; and service.
Our current BS has a relatively large enrollment and our graduate program is among the largest at OSU and thus supports OSU’s goals for access and student learning. See 1e above regarding our national rankings based on scholarship and faculty productivity, which are the highest in OUS. Many of our faculty serve on state or federal panels, task forces, endangered species recovery teams, as editors of scientific journals, etc., as well as the normal complement of college and university committees.

b. Connection of the proposed program to the institution’s strategic priorities and signature areas of focus.
OSU’s Strategic Plan, Phase II identified science of sustainable Earth ecosystems as a signature area of distinction. Conservation and management of vertebrate organisms is central this signature area. Vertebrate organisms have captured the imagination of the American public and conserving these organisms is a high priority based on national and state policies and funding levels. The name change of our department signals to the public and our colleagues that we intend to stay at the cutting edge of research, teaching and outreach related to sustainability, ecosystem services, ecology and management of vertebrate species, communities and their habitats and ecosystems.

c. Manner in which the proposed program contributes to Oregon University System goals for access; quality learning; knowledge creation and innovation; and economic and cultural support of Oregon and its communities.
See 1e and 2a above. We train many of the fisheries and wildlife professionals in the state and region and have good to excellent employment statistics (see our survey of graduates cited in 1e). We employ over 350 people on an annual basis with our grants and contracts. Furthermore, fish and wildlife resources, which our graduates manage, have substantial prevention of overfishing.
Based on a 2008 economic survey (http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/docs/Report_5_6_09--Final%20(2).pdf), Oregonians and visitors spent $2.5 billion dollars per year on fishing, hunting, shellfishing and wildlife viewing activities and equipment. The long-term sustainability of this economic engine is dependent on effective management of these resources.

d. Manner in which the program meets broad statewide needs and enhances the state’s capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities.
See 2c above for ways in which the program meets state’s economic capacity. The teaching, research and outreach of the department are central to meeting the state’s environmental challenges and opportunities. The science we are engaged in is central to concepts of sustainability, ecosystem services and natural resources management.

3. Accreditation
a. Accrediting body or professional society that has established standards in the area in which the program lies, if applicable.
There is no organization that accredits the degrees we offer. However, the three primary professional societies (American Fisheries Society, Society for Conservation Biology, and The Wildlife Society) all have specific missions and codes of ethics, but these societies do not accredit academic programs.

b. Ability of the program to meet professional accreditation standards. If the program does not or cannot meet those standards, the proposal should identify the area(s) in which it is deficient and indicate steps needed to qualify the program for accreditation and date by which it would be expected to be fully accredited.
Both the American Fisheries Society (AFS [http://www.fisheries.org/afs/certification.html]) and The Wildlife Society (TWS [http://joomla.wildlife.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=29&Itemid=234]) have certification programs designed to certify professionals at two levels (Associate and full certification). However, certification is not a requirement for employment in most state or federal agencies. Graduates of our programs generally qualify for certification depending on electives they choose in their programs.

c. If the proposed program is a graduate program in which the institution offers an undergraduate program, proposal should identify whether or not the undergraduate program is accredited and, if not, what would be required to qualify it for accreditation.
Not applicable—see 3a and 3b above.

d. If accreditation is a goal, the proposal should identify the steps being taken to achieve accreditation. If the program is not seeking accreditation, the proposal should indicate why it is not.
Not Applicable.
4. Need
a. Evidence of market demand.
   Not applicable to name change proposal but see liaison with students, alumni and stakeholders with respect to support for name change (Appendix B).

   b. If the program’s location is shared with another similar OUS program, proposal should provide externally validated evidence of need (e.g., surveys, focus groups, documented requests, occupational/employment statistics and forecasts).
   Not applicable to name change proposal.

   c. Manner in which the program would serve the need for improved educational attainment in the region and state.
   Not applicable to name change proposal.

   d. Manner in which the program would address the civic and cultural demands of citizenship.
   Not applicable to name change proposal.

5. Outcomes and Quality Assessment
a. Expected learning outcomes of the program.
   Not applicable to name change proposal but see 1e above.

   b. Methods by which the learning outcomes will be assessed and used to improve curriculum and instruction.
   Not applicable to name change proposal but see 1e above.

   c. Program performance indicators, including prospects for success of program graduates (employment or graduate school) and consideration of licensure, if appropriate.
   Not applicable to name change proposal but see 1e above.

   d. Nature and level of research and/or scholarly work expected of program faculty; indicators of success in those areas.
   Not applicable to name change proposal but see 1e above.

6. Program Integration and Collaboration
a. Closely related programs in other OUS universities and Oregon private institutions.
   There are no closely related programs in OUS. The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife offers the only degrees related to the fish and wildlife professions in the Oregon University System and no degrees are offered in Conservation Biology within the system.

   b. Ways in which the program complements other similar programs in other Oregon institutions and other related programs at this institution. Proposal should identify the potential for collaboration.
   Not applicable to name change proposal. However, some of our undergraduate classes are required or are common electives in several programs (Environmental Sciences, Forest
Engineering, Forest Resources, Natural Resources, and Rangeland Ecology and Management
and Zoology), and our undergraduate minor is commonly taken by students in Environmental
Sciences, Forest Resources, and Zoology. Many of our graduate classes are taken by students in
Environmental Sciences, Forest Science, Rangeland Ecology and Management, Sustainable
Natural Resources and Zoology. Few of our classes are taken by students at other OUS
institutions. We have had discussions with other programs on campus regarding developing an
interdisciplinary MS degree in Conservation Biology and will continue to pursue those
discussions.

c. If applicable, proposal should state why this program may not be collaborating with
existing similar programs.
Not applicable to name change proposal.

d. Potential impacts on other programs in the areas of budget, enrollment, faculty workload,
and facilities use.
We do not anticipate any major impacts to our unit or other units on campus. It may result in a
small increase in undergraduate majors that may be attracted to OSU because of the added
search term “conservation.” We anticipate increased interest in our graduate programs and
the number of potential students contacting our faculty. However, because we discourage
students from applying before they have contacted faculty and because we only accept
students that can be supported on assistantships (predominately GRAs), we anticipate a small
increase in number of graduate applications and no change in the number of students admitted.

We do not anticipate significant impacts on other units. Each year we have 10-15
undergraduate transfers from other programs on campus (predominately from Animal Science,
Biology, Environmental Science, and Zoology) after they take one or two of our classes and
understand the nature of the science we conduct. It is possible that these students might have
selected our program initially with a different name.

There are faculty who do research related to conservation biology all over campus
(Agricultural and Natural Resources Economics, Botany and Plant Pathology, Crop and Soil
Sciences, Forest Ecosystems and Society, Forest Resources Management, Geosciences, Range
Ecology and Management, Sociology, Zoology). Depending on the outcome of reorganization
efforts across campus, some of these faculty members may wish to become part of our
renamed unit if they feel their research foci no longer fits within the mission of their
reorganized units. We have not encouraged these conversations.

7. Financial Sustainability (attach the completed Budget Outline)

a. Business plan for the program that anticipates and provides for its long-term financial
viability, addressing anticipated sources of funds, the ability to recruit and retain faculty,
and plans for assuring adequate library support over the long term.
Not applicable to name change proposal. See Appendix A.

b. Plans for development and maintenance of unique resources (buildings, laboratories,
technology) necessary to offer a quality program in this field.
Not applicable to name change proposal.

c. Targeted student/faculty ratio (student FTE divided by faculty FTE).

Not applicable to name change proposal.

d. Resources to be devoted to student recruitment.
Not applicable to name change proposal.

8. External Review (if the proposed program is a graduate level program, follow the guidelines provided in External Review of new Graduate Level Academic Programs in addition to completing all of the above information)
Not applicable to name change proposal. However, see external liaison with students, alumni and stakeholders regarding proposed name change (Appendix B).
Appendix A. Budget.
Budget Outline Form
Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for 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.

Institution: Oregon State University
Program: Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology
Academic Year: 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
<th>LINE ITEM TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>( \sum )</td>
<td>( \sum )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships/Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrecurring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Budget Outline Form**

**Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for 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.

Institution: Oregon State University

Program: Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology

Academic Year: 2010-2011

Indicate the year: _____ First X Second _____ Third _____ Fourth

*Prepare one page each of the first four years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personnel**

- Faculty (Include FTE)
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
- Support Staff (Include FTE)
- Fellowships/Scholarships
- OPE
- Nonrecurring

| Personnel Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Other Resources**

- Library/Printed
- Library/Electronic
- Supplies and Services
- Equipment
- Other Expenses

| Other Resources Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Physical Facilities**

- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

| Physical Facilities Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**GRAND TOTAL**

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
Budget Outline Form
Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for 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.

Institution: Oregon State University
Program: Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology
Academic Year: 2011-2012

Indicate the year: _____ First _____ Second X _____ Third _____ Fourth

Prepare one page each of the first four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Item</td>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships/Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrecurring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget Outline Form

### Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for 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.

Institution: Oregon State University  
Program: Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology  
Academic Year: 2012-2013

Indicate the year:  
First  
Second  
Third  
Fourth

Prepare one page each of the first four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budgetary Unit</th>
<th>Institutional Reallocation</th>
<th>Special State Appropriation</th>
<th>Federal Funds and Other Grants</th>
<th>Fees, Sales and Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (Include FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships/Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrecurring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budgetary Unit</th>
<th>Institutional Reallocation</th>
<th>Special State Appropriation</th>
<th>Federal Funds and Other Grants</th>
<th>Fees, Sales and Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library/Printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Resources Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budgetary Unit</th>
<th>Institutional Reallocation</th>
<th>Special State Appropriation</th>
<th>Federal Funds and Other Grants</th>
<th>Fees, Sales and Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Facilities Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

0 0 0 0 0 0
Appendix B. External Liaison Correspondence

Message sent to students, alumni, and stakeholder (state and federal agencies and non-government organizations) in August 2008 proposing the name change.

Dear Colleagues,

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife at Oregon State University is considering a name change, and as one of our students, alumni or stakeholders, I would like your input. We are proposing to change our name to the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology. There are a number of reasons we are considering this change:

1. The additional term “Conservation Biology” is a better description of the research, teaching and outreach efforts of our faculty and a better characterization of the curricula we offer at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
2. We believe the name will be more appealing to today’s students because of an increasing interest in conservation as a result of proliferation of media stories and content related to conservation of natural resources.
3. The new name would better differentiate us from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Although this is a minor justification, we do get a large number of calls each year from people who think they are calling ODFW, suggesting confusion among the public about the respective roles of these two agencies.

The idea of a name change has enthusiastic support among our faculty, but I want to check with you, our stakeholders. Please send me any comments you would like to offer by 31 August.

Summary of responses regarding department name change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by group. Note, many stakeholder are also alumni. In those cases we tried to put them in a group based on the perspective they presented (my department vs agency). We removed the names from the students’ comments to protect the innocent. Some of the alumni and stakeholders only signed a first name or had no signature and we could not tell from the address who the comment was from. At the end of the comments is a list of the alternative names suggested.

Students (names removed for confidentiality)

I am in full support of the name change. I agree with the points that you made, and I feel that not all the fish geeks in our department are involved with fisheries. As a matter of fact I think that there are more students on the fish side that are interested in non-fisheries related studies...
than fisheries related ones. I think the name change will have a positive impact for the future of the department.

Since you do not foresee a name change on the degrees, then I am all for the name change of the department!

I think it sounds amazing and I'm all for it, longer titles are cool!

I think the name change is a great idea. I believe that any time we can educate the public, especially with a new keyword in the title of our department, greatly reflects what we are doing. We need to get the word out about conservation. Another positive about changing the name is that we won't be stereotyped as JUST hunters and fishermen to the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion in this manner. I am excited to hear about the proposed name change for our department, and think it accurately represents much of the work that we are involved in. I know some other students have made comments to the tone of "what's the difference", but I see this as a huge change in the philosophy of science conducted by our department.

I am currently writing my Master's thesis and have struggled with the communication of conclusions/inferences from my work. As a graduate student I have learned the foibles of advocacy in science, and have struggled in presenting my work from a conservation standpoint. I am passionate about my subject and find my writing much more inspired when I feel that this department supports my conservation ethic. Historically this department (and our field of study) has catered to resource managers trying to harvest for sustainable yields. I view myself as an ecologist and conservation scientist, not a fisheries manager, and am glad to see the new approach our department is considering. In light of this recent report on the quality of conservation science coming out of Oregon State University, I believe now would be an excellent time to capitalize on this publicity. I believe changing our department’s name to “Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Science” will facilitate the continued recognition of our department nationally, and will further aid the recruitment of bright, young, future scientists into the OSU family.

Thank you for seeking feedback. I appreciate it as I am about to earn a degree from this department! My vote is to NOT include the word conservation in the department name. I feel that this imparts an air of advocacy to our department that may lead others to challenge the credibility of the science we produce. I will temper that position by adding that I agree with point #3 in your email and support that perspective.

I think that this would be a good change to the department. For someone that is new to the university their initial impression by the title may be that this department is solely focused around fish and game management as I did when I first became a student at OSU, this turned me off a bit from it. After I looked into the department further and have experienced the courses the department has to offer my view has completely changed. Also, since we are able to choose a specialization that is unique to the individual we are able to take classes from other
departments that also incorporate conservation issues. I know quite a few people including myself who chose to have the word conservation in their specialization. I may be biased because of this, but aside form that I agree that this change would attract more students due to the growing interest in conservation issues, which would benefit the department.

I like the idea of getting "conservation" into the department name, but in my opinion the new title is not inclusive of the research we do, and it's too long. How about "Department of Conservation Biology," or "Department of Biological Conservation"? Since "biology" is "science" (last I checked), you get the implication that it's rigorous and at the same time dealing with organisms of some sort. "Fish and Wildlife" doesn't seem to leave room for inverts and plants, which we do study. "Fish and Wildlife" also (to me anyway) implies "target species" that people hunt and fish for, and I think if you want to attract a new breed of student that may limit their perceptions of the department.

I think that the new name would be great. It sounds a little more professional. I think that putting the conservation science part on there more accurately portrays the department.

It sounds like a mouthful to me....While I agree with the reasons for change, the name is just too long. Is there anyway to shorten it at all?

When we came up with RAFWE we also talked about the appropriate name for that event. We added ecology to broaden the scope from fish & wildlife since some folks in the department don't study fish or wildlife. I could see something like this be an appropriate name as well: Department of Fish, Wildlife & Ecosystem Conservation Science. It would cover some more courses that are offered in our department as well. I am sure you have talked about an option like this and it might have other issues to it, but I would prefer that name.

I'm not crazy about the proposed name, but I understand and the need for, and support a change. I think using 'conservation science' may be a little narrow in the minds of some people. While it may attract a new group of prospective students, it could dissuade many others. I think 'Fish & Wildlife Biology' or something similar would be more appealing to more people. I don't think it would be wise to pigeon-hole the department with a name as narrow as the proposed one.

Too many words! A title should reflect what people will speak (most importantly) and write. Now, we are referred to "Fisheries and Wildlife". Adding Conservation Science will not change that ............... we will then be referred to as "Fish and Wildlife" ............... making it more likely to be confused with ODFW. Think about the rest of campus: Geosciences, Zoology, Political Science, Veterinary Medicine, Animal Science, and on and on... 1 or 2 word titles.......So.... How about "Dept of Conservation Biology" "Dept of Wildlife Biology" - this is defined as including fish biology too, or just "Department of Fish and Wildlife. 4 words is too long...............
Alumni
Works OK for me -- I’m not a big fan of name changing to fit the latest audience & generally prefer to stick with tradition -- but, in this case the sense of tradition is mostly retained by keeping "fish and wildlife" in the name (versus, for example, Dept. of Conservation Science -- which would have lost the F&W link). Dennis R. Lassuy

What’s the world coming to? A PC name for the DFW… I guess I can see the point- and at least you are going to keep the name more or less the same- not changing to “Natural Resource Conservation” or some such blandness. You have to stay proud of your “Bait and Bullet” background- between the anti-gun and PETA people here in the East I’m sometimes surprised we still have a DFW and actual hunting… but the same people get pretty upset when the deer eat their landscaping, or the beavers flood their septic systems, or a coyote shows up in the back yard. How can we educate the general population that “conservation” does not equal “preservation” and that healthy wildlife populations can be maintained with harvest? Caleb Slater

I have an issue with lengthy names and titles. I truly wish there was a way to shorten the name. Personally I feel that conservation is part of the science. Actually, now that I think of it aren’t these terms contradictory? Science is science and conservation as much as I appreciate it is a policy statement.

My only comment would be more emphasis on management (as in the Department of Fish and Wildlife Conservation Science and Management?). From my experience working with young folks coming into positions with regulatory agencies and also serving on the TWS Certification Review Board, there seems to be a need to refocus on “the art and science of manipulating habitats and populations to achieve a desired goal”. People can have good backgrounds in biology/ecology but without practical knowledge regarding what can and can’t be done on the ground given economic, regulatory, and societal constraints, the theoretical aspects can be pretty meaningless. Just my opinion. Bob Carey

I like all of your arguments for the name change, and I support the basic premises behind them. My only concern with the name change is with what I call the "usability factor". Though it seems trivial, Department of Fish and Wildlife Conservation Science" is a little long and cumbersome. Our records and admissions building, Boyle Education Center, became "BEC". Federal Express became "FedEx", and G.I. Joe's became just "Joes". You can change the name, which may be useful as a recruiting aid in the catalog, and on the web. The addition of Conservation Science to the department name may catch the attention of some folks, but my guess is you will be forever referred to as "OSU Fish and Wildlife". One last thought - have you talked to the folks who will be answering the phones how they feel about the name change? So I guess bottom line, I would support the name change, with just a cautionary suggestion that we not hope for too much change in how folks perceive the department. Bret Michalski

A great idea and an attractive name. Getting "fisheries" out of the name disassociates your department from harvest. That's important. Now if you could just disassociate from the forestry department. John Deshler
How about the subtle change to Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Science? Less clunky, more to the point, and a bit further away from the ODFW name than the current one. Justin Soares

I think a name change could be good, but not so sure about the Conservation part. I do think Dept. of Fisheries and Wildlife Science would help those who don't know the department take it more seriously and clear the confusion with ODFW. Lisa Reiley

My only concern is that potential employers who are used to hiring employees with degrees in Fish and Wildlife may not understand it is the same thing. It does kind of sound like a degree spit out from an overnight pay a lot of money receive a little education university like ITT Tech or University of Phoenix. April Lindeman

I don't have strong feelings one way or the other, but I doubt that adding a couple of fancy words at the end will change some people's opinion about what we wildlife people do. Eric Forsman

Well, I would like to say that the idea is interesting because it gives a better indication that wildlife science is an applicable science, not just an academic field. This may be not too important in the US, as you guys have a long history on wildlife conservation, but this is my feeling. We deal with this kind of problem here in Brazil, as most of our biology programs ends up in ecology, zoology or botany (nothing as an applicable science such as conservation, despite many programs hold the Conservation word in their names). Walfrido Tomas

Sounds reasonable at first glance. But, I'm not sure that the core curricula reflects the conservation science umbrella, at least the current classes. I know this would disturb many of the old guard, but is the perceived problem the "Fish and Wildlife" part of the name? What about Dept. of Wildlife Conservation Science (fish are wildlife by the way) or Dept. of Conservation Science? I'm sure you have tested those out already. Charlie Bruce, ODFW

I am in agreement that a name change is needed. However, instead of using the word "Conservation", how about calling it Environmental Science. After all, students are taking courses in soil science, botany (trees, shrubs, forbes and grasses), entomology and hydrology. How about considering changing to Department if Fish, Wildlife and Environmental Sciences? When I accepted the faculty position of Asoc. Prof. at SUNY College of Forestry in Syracuse in 1968, I heard talke about a possible name change. It became the College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry a year or so later. The Department of Biological Sciences included Fisheries and Wildlife, along with Soil Science, Hydrology, Botany and Entomology. I hope you and your faculty will give my suggestion some consideration. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make a suggestion. Regards, Austin Hamer

First, I must state that those persons within the university and among conservation organizations that maintain a persistent belief that the research and educational curricula related to conserving fish and wildlife resources contains very little science and is more art or
guesswork aimed purely at putting out fires are not going to change their opinion based upon a name change. Those people have a problem, and it is probably a bad case of ignorance or worse, and a name change won't help that. The above being said, I would like to comment that I like your current designation. If a change is needed for a significantly important reason, such as reducing the confusion between your department and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, that has some merit, though as you say, it is minor. The reputation of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife at Oregon State University in producing scientifically sound research and management work in fisheries and wildlife conservation is well known by those professionals in the field, and those aspiring to get there. Other than the above, I don't think a name change will improve anything. Joe Greenley

Consider changing the name to fish and wildlife management. I believe that conservation is a subset of management, but the term conservation has preservation connotations to some. Charlie Corrarino (ODFW)

I don't have a serious objection. However, I am always skeptical of changes in name, logo or organization. They are expensive, in terms of reprinting everything and offer confusion to those not tracking such things...but finding the change later and asking “what for”? I think the current name is just fine and would not change it unless there were stronger justification. This name and the work it stands for have a long history and that history should be respected. For anyone who spends a few moments looking over the staff and results of the department, there is no confusion on the science end. Anyone who will simply look at the name and not go any further than that, before drawing conclusions, is not worth changing for, in my opinion. Finally, for some, the insertion of Conservation Science will be read as code for endangered species as opposed to fisheries and wildlife management....and that has connotations as well. In summary, if it were up to me, I would leave the name alone and focus on more substantive issues like the budget for innovative new classes and programs. If you think this name change will make any positive difference to funders, then it is worth considering seriously.-- Jim Martin

This is a good idea. The word "fisheries" has obvious economic connotations, similar to "game," and diverts the focus from the department’s research focus. Lori Hennings, Portland Metro

I'm torn, since effective info goes down with the number of words. I like Conservation and I like Science, but having both seems to push the name over a sort of size threshold in my mind. How about "Conservatience"? (kidding) "Animal Conservation Science" is more concise, but will be unfamiliar to fish-and-wildlifers. So, as is often the case, I don't super like the new name, but don't have a great alternative to provide. Eric Schauber, Southern Illinois University

This sounds like conversations that have popped up on occasion here at MSU. Anyway, I wonder about the loss of the term fisheries. Maybe that reflects the department, but changing from fisheries to fish suggests more of a focus on zoology than management. I don't mind the conservation. Also, changing to fish only makes the department sound even more like ODFW. My thoughts would be: Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and Management--Geoffrey Habron, Michigan State University
At first glance, I like the name change proposal. If it is a better description of what actually occurs in the department and would have wider appeal, it sounds logical to me. Jack Williams, Trout Unlimited

I appreciate the reasons for the name change and think the inclusion of the words 'conservation' and 'science' exemplifies the department's focus. However, for the same reasons, I wonder why the department is still retaining the words 'fish' and 'wildlife,' as these words retain the restricted interpretation by some conservation-minded individuals as excluding non-fish and wildlife species. The word 'ecology,' on the other hand, has important 'values' in the minds of many conservation and ecology organizations because it embraces the scientific study of the distribution and abundance of living organisms (fish, wildlife, and others) and how their distribution and abundances are affected by interactions among organisms and their environments. Therefore, I encourage the department to also consider striking the words 'fish and wildlife' and consider including the word 'ecology' in the department's name. Ecology might be included into the name like this: Department of Ecology and Conservation Science. Jeff Manning, U Idaho

Boo--1. While we’re in the business of conserving fish and wildlife, I hardly feel as if I’m a Conservation Scientist. I’m a Fish Biologist. 2. For those who believe our work is hocus-pocus and not science, I highly doubt changing the department name will change their minds. If a change is what they desire, we should change our actions, not our name. 3. I don’t know how kids choose colleges these days but a wise man once told me that we better root for the Beavs if we want to increase attendance in the department. 4. What’s so wrong with being confused with ODFW?? Seriously, that’s an unfortunate similarity and one that will likely be corrected when legislature merges ODFW and ODF into ODNR (natural resources).

I support the name change. Your reasoning is sound. I believe the title to be more descriptive of what is clearly emphasized in the department's undergraduate and graduate education curricula. The change properly emphasizes the core mission of the fisheries and wildlife educational process at Oregon State. Pat O'Donogue

The addition of the word “science” makes a great deal of sense and will hopefully serve as a reminder that the management of fish and wildlife is a science which requires knowledge and skill. I doubt that you will change many minds with the change though. Unfortunately resource management has become politicized and thus has lost its respectability in the minds of many. The word “Conservation” brings to mind the “locking-up or putting-away out of reach” and does not, to many people, allow for fishing (recreational and especially commercial) or hunting. I would point to forestry where the term “conservation” has become synonymous in the minds of many with no logging or harvest. I know that is not what you mean but you could find yourself spending great amounts of time explaining such. Perhaps the term “Resource” would be a suitable substitute. Perhaps the name The Department of Fish and Wildlife Resource Science would be an acceptable substitute.
The concern is the same as above – conservation can mean locking-up or putting-away, not the wise, science based multiple use approach. Thus students may have a very different set of expectations that do not encompass the use of the resource even in a carefully crafted manner.

I would think some confusion might be eliminated if the term “Department of” were eliminated from the name. In forestry, we use the terms “Forest Engineering”, “Forest Management”, “Wood Science and Technology” and others. The term “Department of Forest Engineering” or “Department of Forest Management” are avoided. This should also help in the confusion of your school and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to some extent. I think that while you may be able to reduce the confusion, there will always remain some. This is especially true in the fact that while you may change the name for you, the staff as well as future students, the name will stay the same for much of the public (especially older folks) no matter how much publicity the change receives. (How many older individuals still refer the University as OAC or OSC?) To many you are and always will be “OSU Department of Fisheries and Wildlife” or even the “OSU School of Fish and Wildlife” and that will never change. Mike and Kay Brown

Stakeholders
The change indicates an intellectual and programmatic shift from a focus on both utilization and conservation science to one focused primarily on conservation. Fish and wildlife resources provide society with both short and long term benefits and consumptive and non-consupitive benefits. A science that focus only on one type of benefit will fail to meet society's need or knowledge that enhances and balances overall social welfare. Choosing either utilization or conservation science is also inconsistent with the multi-objective mission of a Land and Sea Grant College. And ultimately, emphasis on either conservation or utilization will lead to a false choice making it more difficult for units in the College of Agricultural Science to conduct the creative science that helps society improve both utilization and conservation-related benefits.

I am also concerned about catering to students who are attracted to conservation programs due at least in part to a "proliferation of media stories." It is true -- today, many undergrad and graduate students are attracted to programs and curriculum at the University due to an emphasis on conservation and resource protection. But the reality is far more complex. Some of our best moments as educators occur when students begin to grasp the complex and interdependent issues associated with resource science and management. Such moments can occur when students understand that if we treat renewable resources as long term valuable assets that a portion of contemporary returns can be used to reinvest in the science and management needed to enhance long term benefits. I would hope that the pendulum in popular thinking and "media stories" could one day shift to reflect such broader understanding.

Finally, and maybe most importantly, such a name change would place COMES faculty who have their academic home in the Dept of F&W in a potentially untenable position. Our faculty have job descriptions that reflect the COMES mission of conducting research to understand, utilize, and sustain marine resources and coastal ecosystems in order to benefit the citizens of Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, the Nation, and the World. This mission was co-developed by
our faculty, advisory board, and key stakeholders. Some of our best research has objectives that simultaneously improve utilization while also enhancing conservation; often this research is conducted in close collaboration and partnerships with coastal communities and industries. Quite frankly, some of our faculty might need to find other academic homes if the department changes its name and its underlying intellectual and programmatic emphasis.

Please feel free to share my perspective with your faculty and others participating in this discussion. Gil Sylvia (COMES).

Well, you will still offer management classes too won’t you? Hopefully it won’t be all feel good conservation stuff. Not that it’s not important- it is- but you know there are a lot of us working in the fisheries field who deal with angling regs, harvest, politics, education, and a whole host of other things that aren’t strictly research or have little to do with conservation. Many people still have the “it’s a little brown bird” mentality and really don’t do the conservation/diversity agenda. I will be frank here and tell you that many people are choosing Humboldt over OSU as they feel that OSU is TOO research orientated and not enough hands on training. My prejudiced opinion here- since I think research work would be hideous and much rather prefer working the crowd, financing research projects, and dealing with politics. But then I am not totally sane either.

I agree with you here. However, some people also tend to play the “dueling scientist” game too. Sometime some of these processes like setting angling regs are like making sausage- you don’t want to know how it’s done. I think it’s important to teach students that you may have the best cutting edge research/science and be able to prove without a doubt that the agency should be heading one way, but one call from a senator who has an angry constituency reduces all of your work to zero. It’s political science for the most part in the real world of management. Sorry to be such a cynic but at 10+ years of experience I’m not the Pollyanna I was.

Maybe people do look at names. I think a lot of folks look at price, what the program has to offer, location, etc. I would agree that conservation is much more appealing to folks as we see angler numbers drop off over the years.

Since no one has called me and thought it was OSU maybe you’re right.

Personally, I like the name “OSU Fish and Wildlife Management Department”, or maybe just “OSU Fish and Wildlife Sciences”. My degree says Fisheries Science and I’m Ok with that (even though it’s a clever forgery, ha ha). I would leave the conservation out. Yes, bird/critter watching is on the rise, but there’s still a ton of folks out there who hunt and fish. Theoretically, they purchase licenses to allow ODFW to manage these populations. They also expect us to conserve them as well, and protect some populations from harvest. So I’m not sure if conservation is really the word for the degree you get, it’s a part of the degree. Do I get a new degree if you change names? Laura Tesler (ODFW and alumnus)
As you are well aware, the science aspect of all we do at ODFW is critical when dealing with our state's resources and informing the public and other agencies about what we do and why we make decisions (it's surprising how often we in ODFW get feedback that we make rules and decisions capriciously). With this in mind, by using Conservation Biology as part of the name it will let people know that the research being performed in the Department and that graduates from the Department are well versed in the scientific aspect of resource management. It may even help to convince some students to join the department and pursue careers in fish and wildlife science.

A valid point since we, in ODFW, also get confused at times with the Department. Especially those of us that are fortunate to be housed at the University and even more so those like the staff in Fish Health that are housed in the same building as the Department. I am 100% behind the idea of the name change. Tony Amandi ODFW

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this. I wasn't going to take the time to do so, since at first look it seems like this is a fairly easy decision. However, having moved into the management of fish and wildlife after spending considerable time in academic and research settings, I started having second thoughts about the Department's name change.

In my personal opinion, I feel that universities (our society's primary producers of scientists and resource managers) should be unbiased at a social level to maintain credibility and produce the highest caliber of scientist and resource manager, who in their jobs should ideally be unbiased so they can best follow the tenets of good science and implement scientific findings and resource policy, respectively. To me, this means universities should concentrate on (in no particular order) 1) actively uncovering new information (= research - doing, and teaching how to do, science), 2) passing on information (= teaching what research has uncovered), and 3) preparing students to apply information out in the general public (= management, which also must take into account social concerns, values, and priorities).

Placing the term "conservation" in the Department's title adds a social value judgment which, in my opinion, is definitely biased; "conservation" lies on one distinct side of a continuum of actions related to resource use, and any given action taken for any particular issue ultimately is a social decision landing somewhere on that continuum. Thus, at the very least there would be a perceived social bias if "conservation" was in the Department's name. Clearly, conservation needs must be a part of science, teaching, and management, but, in the academic setting, I feel conservation should be viewed as a result rather than the cause.

Please don't get me wrong, I feel that resource conservation is extremely important and will only become more so, but if the Department's goal is to produce reputable, unbiased scientists, educators, and managers, I don't think bias should be included in it's name. I also don't think that having an unbiased education precludes scientists, educators, or managers from having (and acting upon) a social conscience and values. I just think that these should be framed in the right perspective relative to the goals of the Department.

To add something constructive, I would suggest the following name:
Department of Fish and Wildlife Information
a. See the 3 items above on how the possible goals of the Department are embodied in the word "information".
b. In addition to these 3 ways "information" applies to the Department, there is also an allusion to "information science". As I work at ODFW, I see an incredible need for (and struggle with) the integration of information science (i.e., computer tools: GIS, databases, programming, internet accessibility, servers) with fish and wildlife management. What managers are asked to do is becoming increasingly complex, especially given the vast number of needs, regulations, and interests, the overwhelming amount of potential or existing information out there, and the need to more widely coordinate and communicate information internally and externally. Managers are also starting to see the importance of marketing (i.e., another type of "information") in order to achieve goals, recruit constituents, elucidate connections to other social activities, and generate new revenue streams. Scientists are already very integrated into the use of traditional information sciences (I learned a programming language for one research project).
c. Related to "b", adding "conservation" to academic departments' names seems to me to be a trend that has been around for a while. The "Information" name might inspire thought on ways the Department could go in new directions and remain a clear leader in the education of fish and wildlife scientists and managers. Another way to say this is that I think the need for conservation is generally agreed upon at a social scale (i.e., "old news", even if not always the highest priority for some) and the growing need is how to integrate and/or balance resource needs (conservation) with other social needs resulting from our growing population and social complexity. To me, what will allow this to happen is information organization, access, and presentation (which the entire fish and wildlife management field seems behind on), as well as information generation (science).
d. We live in the "Information Age" and this adds a little modernity to the Department's name, possibly attracting those who have grown up in this digital age.
e. It could lend itself to some catchy phrases ("Information: Generated, Taught, Applied"; "Information: Understood"; "Taking Fish and Wildlife Needs to the Next Level"). Tom Stahl (ODFW and alumnus)

I think a name change that accurately reflects the research and curricula of the department is acceptable. I also think a name change will achieve the other intended objectives. However, I feel that more than a name change may be necessary if we are to truly change the perception/image of the department. I appreciate you asking for our input. John Helgesson

I like the name change and the rationale for doing it. I have the continuing concern of integrating science and management. Science informed management is the goal and the outcome is conservation of ecosystems that provide public benefits. We have a need for conservation science and conservation management. A more accurate name for what the department does will help define the academic purpose, attract students and perhaps change
the agency some of them will work for. That is a lot to put on a name change, but it endorses the reason for doing it.  Bill M. Bakke, Native fish society

Gosh, we'd discussed this in Roby's Conservation Bio class years ago, for all the reasons you mention below. I'm glad the faculty is onboard. I'm definitely onboard! Good on ya! Wow, I'm a stakeholder now!? : ) Anne Mary Myers (ODFW and alumnus)

My first thought is the new name sounds like too much of a mouthful. I like the idea of separating it from ODFW better. "Conservation Biology" might also alienate some. "Conservation Biology" brings to mind the ecological aspects of the science and not the nuts and bolts such as those interested in propagation, pathology, physiology, etc. While the work is done with conservation in mind, doesn't smoothly fit under the title. The same with those interested in Policy, which while based on science (hopefully) might turn people off. I'd be more for adding Science and dropping Conservation. I guess it sounds too much like the word of the day to me, but I still refer to Reser Stadium as Parker Stadium, so what do I know. Is the Department having a hard time recruiting students, i.e. is the current name a problem? Just so you don't change it to the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries..... Mary Buckman (ODFW and alumnus)

I flat hate it. That name indicates to me that Oregon State is moving even farther to the left and selling out the food producers in Oregon. Why not the something like (Department of Fish and Wildlife Sciences). The word conservation has tremendous negative connotations amongst many people on the coast it means to us you just want to lock up the resources of the people of this state. The second reason to say (NO) is it cost money to change names. When I read, the two names my staff, their reaction was, Why? It is a waste the money to change all headings when the present name tells what you do. Dan, I respect you, but need to get out in the field more before you make a change like this. Personally I know a lot industry people who would never leave a dime to a organization with the word conservation in it. Terry Thompson, County Commissioner

I think you are on the right track, but I would drop the term, "conservation," and leave in "science," as that one word may limit the department in seeking funding from all sources. I know that there exist very generous people who would gift their ranch or cash equivalents to OSU, but who would balk at contributing to an entity that they perceive as extremist, and I am not saying that OSU is, of course. Carter Kerns, FW Commissioner

Do you really want the word "conservation" in the title? Why not just science? It could lead to some concerns related to the current "Conservation Biology" that means to many, a non-traditional science approach to the natural sciences; but then again I could be seeing ghosts related to the issue. Pete Test, ODFW

Why not something like Department of Fish and Wildlife Sciences or something a bit more simple and clean cut? I personally find it stifling and long winded, but thus are the changing times. I think the department has a lot more to it than Conservation Science, and that by naming it such it is a very limited and narrow representation. Trish Yarwood
It is a mouthful, but it is a positive name that accurately captures the evolution of the science of fish/wildlife conservation. My alma mater, UF, underwent a similar name change for similar reasons. Peg Boulay, ODFW

I would propose dropping the word Conservation as I see it being rather restrictive. But, I know what it is like to ask people for their opinions! Dixon Landers, EPA

My only comment would be to pluralize Science to Sciences, it sounds better when spoken out loud. Bobby Levy, FW Commissioner

My immediate thought was that the Department should reflect more than the pure science side of fish and wildlife education. That applies to engineering, forestry, agriculture or whatever. My forestry studies were lacking the non science of a good "education", in fact I often referred to it as "training." I believe OSU students will continue to have a fairly well rounded education regardless of the name. Zane Smith, FW Commissioner

I like the change - it better reflects the typical role for future graduates (more conservation and less hook and bullet). For many of us we are already there. I support the change. Mark Chilcote (ODFW and alumnus)

**Alternative Names Proposed**
Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Science (3)
Department of Biological Conservation
Department of Fish, Wildlife & Ecosystem Conservation Science
Fish & Wildlife Biology
Dept of Wildlife Biology
Department of Fish and Wildlife Conservation Science and Management
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and Management
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Science
Dept. of Fisheries and Wildlife Science (4)
Dept. of Wildlife Conservation Science
Dept. of Conservation Science
Department of Fish and Wildlife Environmental Science
Fish and Wildlife Management (2)
Department of Ecology and Conservation Science
Department of Fish and Wildlife Resource Science
Fish and Wildlife Information
Responses to Liaison with Other Units

Liaison requests with the draft category I proposal attached were email to 43 people on 9 December 2009 with a response requested by 15 January 2010. The liaison message clearly stated that lack of response would be interpreted as support of the proposal. Appendix C contains the original message and the responses to our proposal. A summary of the responses is presented in the table below. Of the 43 people on the original liaison request, 30 did not respond; 7 responded with specific support for the proposal (1 of these questioned the timing); and 6 responses expressed concerns about the proposal.

The concerns regarding our proposal fell into two categories: (1) concerns about the timing with other restructuring conversations occurring at OSU and how this name change might align with those conversations (Bloomer, Salwasser, Flick, Gallagher, and Muir); and (2) objections to the name because expertise in conservation biology is represented in other units on campus (McComb, Muir). We offered responses to those concerns in our draft proposal.

On 17 March, the Curriculum Council requested that we specifically contact five individuals (Joe Beatty, Andy Blaustein, Mike Borman, Paul Doescher, and Lynda Ciufetti) that either were not listed in the original liaison request, or whom did not respond. All five responded that they were supportive of the proposal (but see Blaustein’s “unofficial” statement about timing and other units—you have got to love the guy). Doescher suggested another name (... and Conservation Science) might be better and Ciufetti’ support was contingent on the name change not impinging on Botany and Plant Pathology’s future interest in developing restoration ecology or conservation biology options in their curricula. Because others were copied on these responses, we also received additional (more detailed) comments (McComb, Salwasser and Tesch). The recent emails are listed at the end of the liaison responses and they have been added to Table 2. Thus, after the two sets of liaison responses we have identified three concerns (timing/alignment with other unit transformations, Fisheries and Wildlife is not the only venue for conservation biology, renaming might preclude curricular development in other units) and some alternative names have been proposed. We address those concerns in the following paragraphs.

Timing or Alignment with Other Unit Transformations

Five (six?—see Blaustein’s “unofficial” statement) respondents expressed concern about the timing of our name change proposal and how the name change might affect realignment with other units in transitions. As far as timing goes, we believe this is an ideal time. As restructuring conversations move forward there will be a lot of Category I proposals for changing names, unit structure and curricula. Because this is simply a name change without restructuring the department or changing curricula, we would prefer to be first in the queue. The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife meets all academic and administrative guidelines for minimum faculty, student and class sizes. There have been no conversations within the Division of Earth Systems Science or College of Agricultural Sciences (CAS) suggesting that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife would be combined with other units and the CAS transformation proposal includes our proposed name.
The conversations in other units across OSU have progressed to the point that we have sufficient clarity about how those transformations will progress and our conclusion is that this name change will not affect other units. The College of Forestry is not proposing any changes beyond those made two years ago. College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences will propose a new name (Earth Sciences) and may consolidate with Geosciences but all three administrators in COAS supported our name change. The College of Science will reorganize the biological sciences into two units tentatively named Molecular/Health and Organismal/Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. Thus, we believe that concerns related timing or alignment with other units are not valid concerns for delaying this proposal.

Our decision to change the name of our department is not sudden or in response to any of the structural realignments being considered at OSU. We began our discussion about changing the name of our department over five years ago and conducted several surveys of student, alumni, and stakeholders. We have proceeded carefully with extensive faculty discussion for several years. The emergence of the University restructuring process makes this requested name change appropriate and constructive.

**Conservation Biology is Represented in Other Units at OSU**

Two (three?—see Blaustein’s “unofficial” statement) people responding to the liaison request objected to our proposal because expertise in conservation biology is represented elsewhere at OSU. We acknowledged that fact in our proposal. Conservation biology is interdisciplinary in nature and draws on the potential expertise of faculty in multiple departments at OSU. Brenda McComb provides an official definition from the Society for Conservation Biology in her more detailed comments in response to the second liaison requests (but, see Salwasser’s follow-up comment). Nevertheless, we are the only department at OSU that *predominately* does research, teaching and outreach related to conservation biology. Of 134 current grants in Fisheries and Wildlife on 26 February 2010, 100 (75%) are related to endangered species, biodiversity or monitoring ecosystem components. We are the only department at OSU with courses that have “conservation biology” in the title (except one that is cross-listed with Zoology and one cross-listed with Microbiology). The professional society representing the discipline, The Society for Conservation Biology, lists academic programs in conservation science ([http://www.conbio.org/Resources/Programs/](http://www.conbio.org/Resources/Programs/)). This is a database that any department can list a conservation-related academic program on. As of 3 March 2010, the Fisheries and Wildlife Department was the only program at OSU that is listed on the database; we have been for over 10 years since the society created the database. Other programs in Oregon that are listed include Biology at UO and SOU, Environmental Studies at Lewis and Clark, and Environmental Sciences and Resources at PSU. Likewise, the society also lists faculty members with interests related to conservation biology ([http://www.conbio.org/Resources/Programs/Search/fs.cfm](http://www.conbio.org/Resources/Programs/Search/fs.cfm)). As of 3 March 2010, 37 of 38 people listed on the database from OSU are associated with Fisheries and Wildlife; Zoology had the only other listing. I believe if we ran a summary of members of the society at OSU that the difference between *interest* in the discipline and *participation* in the professional society would be even more pronounced. We might even find that Fisheries and Wildlife has more graduate students that are members of the society than faculty in all the other departments on campus. Thus, we believe that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife can rightfully claim to be the
center of conservation biology at OSU with activities in the field that dwarf participation by all other programs.

**Name Precludes Curricula Development or Work Related to Conservation Biology in Other Units**

Ciuffetti supported our proposal contingent on the name change not precluding BBP from developing curricula options related to conservation biology or restoration ecology. We have no intention of doing so, and the record is clear about how willing Fisheries and Wildlife has been in collaboratively developing curricula across campus. There is a Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation specialty option in Natural Resources and many Environmental Sciences students minor in Fisheries and Wildlife for their required specialization area. In previous discussions regarding what might become of natural resources at OSU we (Doescher, Edge and McComb) have discussed an interdisciplinary MS Degree in Conservation Biology and intend to pursue that regardless of the outcome of this proposal. We have added text about this in 6b above. The idea that putting the term Conservation Biology in our name might preclude other departments from working in that discipline is absurd. That is no more likely than the use of the term ecology in a new unit in the College of Science might somehow influence the work of ecologists in our department or several others on campus.

**Alternative Names Proposed**

Five of the responses proposed alternative names: Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology (Muir and Tesch); Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Science (McComb); Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Science (Doescher); and Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology and Management (Salwasser). Three of these suggested names restrict the scope by removing the “and” in the title. We do not think these are acceptable alternatives. Faculty in Fisheries and Wildlife are diverse in their interests and expertise (including anthropology, economics, entomology, paleontology, plant ecology and sociology among the more traditional fish and wildlife ecologists). It may seem like semantics for folks outside the discipline, but we do fisheries biology, wildlife biology, and conservation biology. The commas and the “and” in our proposed name were carefully placed. A title without “and” Conservation Biology would disenfranchise many of our Fisheries Biologists or Wildlife Biologists, especially those doing applied science at branch experiment stations. We have aquaculture specialists for example who might reasonably argue they do not belong in a Fisheries Conservation Biology department.

Hal Salwasser’s suggestion of Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology and Management is a non-starter. First it is too long, but more importantly, the majority of practitioners in the natural resources fields view “conservation” as synonymous with “management” (but see some responses by our alumni and stakeholders). Conservation is a more contemporary and more widely used term.

Two responses (Doescher and McComb) proposed the term “Science” instead of “Biology.” Our faculty already had a long debate about the difference in those terms and had another via email between 29 March and 2 April (these emails are available for anyone who has the time). The overwhelming preference among our faculty is for use of the term “Biology” in the name. Conservation Biology has its own professional society, scientific journal, guiding
principles, and postulates; in short, it is a reasonably well-defined field of scientific inquiry devoted to the conservation of the earth’s biodiversity. “Conservation Science” lacks any of these attributes. Conservation Science(s) is an umbrella, a group for specialties, some not in biology and brings in hydrology, atmospheric science, political science and sociology, to name a few.

Table 2. Summary of Liaison Response to Name Change Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/College</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Abbott</td>
<td>COAS</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Arp</td>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Azarenko</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Beatty</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Blaustein</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherm Bloomer</td>
<td>COS</td>
<td>Concerns regarding timing and other opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bolte</td>
<td>Biological and Ecological Engineering</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Borman</td>
<td>Range Ecology and Management</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Bray</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Capalbo</td>
<td>Ag and Resource Economics</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Ciuffetti</td>
<td>Botany and Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Support contingent on being able to develop interdisciplinary degrees or options in BBP in restoration ecology or conservation biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Clarke</td>
<td>CVM</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Doescher</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Support-- Prefers Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo Dreher</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Duncan</td>
<td>COAS</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Flick</td>
<td>Science and Math Ed</td>
<td>Concerns regarding timing; align with other name changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Gable</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Gallagher</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Timing premature or possible affect on other programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Garity</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Harte</td>
<td>Marine Resource Management</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peg Herring</td>
<td>Extension and Exp Station Comm</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jansen</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Jensen</td>
<td>COF</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kaplan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Karow</td>
<td>Crop and Soil Science</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Karplus</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lunch</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Support but concerns regarding timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Males</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Maness</td>
<td>Forest Engineering Resource Management</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Marcus</td>
<td>Environmental and Molecular Tox</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mason</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda McComb</td>
<td>Forest Ecosystems and Society</td>
<td>Does not support—Conservation Biology extends beyond FW—suggested Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McEvoy</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob McGorrin</td>
<td>Food Science and Technology</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McLain</td>
<td>Wood Science and Technology</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McMurray</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Menge</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Muir</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>Concerns about timing and name—suggested FW Conservation Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Rodgers</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Schafer</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Salwasser</td>
<td>COF</td>
<td>Concerns regarding timing—suggested Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tesch</td>
<td>COF</td>
<td>Suggested FW Conservation Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Thompson</td>
<td>Gen Ag/Ag Ed</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Wolf</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Wright</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>No Response/Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Liaison Request and Responses

On Dec 9, 2009, at 8:38 PM, Edge, W. Daniel - FW wrote:

Head/Chair/Director:
The attached Category I proposal describes a rename of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife to the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology. We propose this name change to better represent to the university, students and public the nature of our mission in teaching, research and outreach. We are not proposing to change the curriculum or name of any of the degrees, minors or certificates we offer.

In accordance with the liaison criteria in the Curricular Procedures Handbook, this memo serves as notification to your college/department/program) of our intent to make this curricular change. Please review the attached materials and send your comments, concern, or support to me by 15 January 2010. Your timely response is appreciated. Please note that a lack of response will be interpreted as support.

Thank you for your time and input.

Dan Edge

W. Daniel Edge
Department Head
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
Oregon State University, 104 Nash
Corvallis, OR 97331-3803
Voice: 541-737-2910; FAX -3590
daniel.edge@oregonstate.edu
http://fw.oregonstate.edu/

<FW Name Change Cat I Proposal.pdf>

From: Dreher, Theo
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2009 6:08 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: Re: Curriculum Liaison--Name Change Proposal--response requested by 15 Jan.

Dan,

Sounds like an appropriate move to me. Best wishes.

Theo
Theo W. Dreher, Professor and Chair
Department of Microbiology
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
Tel. 541-737-1795
E-mail theo.dreher@oregonstate.edu
From: Mark Abbott [mark@coas.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2009 7:02 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: Re: Curriculum Liaison--Name Change Proposal--response requested by 15 Jan.

I have no problems though the name is a mouthful...

Mark Abbott
College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-5503
541.737.5195
mark@coas.oregonstate.edu

From: Dan Schafer [schafer@stat.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2009 8:38 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW

Dan,

Although I'll always think of you as the Department of Wild Things That Get In the Way of Agriculture, the Statistics Department has no objection to the proposed name change.

Dan
Dan Schafer
Professor and Chair
Department of Statistics
44 Kidder Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-4606
Ph: (541) 737-1990
Fax: (541) 737-3489

From: Robert Duncan [rduncan@coas.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 8:18 AM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: Re: Curriculum Liaison--Name Change Proposal--response requested by 15 Jan.

Hello Dan:

Your proposal to change the name of your department makes good sense to us. Thanks for the information.

Best regards,
Hi Dan:
I’m just wondering about the timing of the name change, given the ongoing discussions about organization in the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Science? I do expect there will be some opinions about this one, but it might be better to tussle over names after the organization is outlined?

thanks
Sherm
Sherman H. Bloomer
Dean, College of Science
128 Kidder Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-4608
Ph: 541-737-3877
FAX: 541-737-1009
Sherman. Bloomer @oregonstate.edu

Dan and others,

Given all the dynamics in motion with divisional alignment and potential impacts to degree programs and departments, this strikes me as out of synch time wise.

Hal
Dan,
I have to agree with Hal's point. The number of changes going on boggles the mind. This name change would need to be closely aligned with possible changes in the College of Science.

Larry
Lawrence B. Flick, Professor & Chair
Department of Science and Mathematics Education
College of Science -- Oregon State University
253 Weniger Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331
541-737-3664 (voice) 541-737-1817 (FAX)
FlickL@science.oregonstate.edu
http://smed.science.oregonstate.edu/
? Before printing this e-mail, ask yourself if it's necessary. Think Green!

Well, you know COAS. I think you should absolutely change the name. Why wait? If the name reflects the activities of the department, I think you should do it.

Renaming your department as suggested is fine, but as a couple of others have said, this may not be the best time, given all the upheaval now in progress across campus. (But substantively, it's fine with us here in Poli Sci.)
The Best,

Bill

+-------------------------------------------------------------+

From: McComb, Brenda
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 6:56 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW

Dan,

We certainly need CB branded on campus -- no doubt about that -- and I have to be an obstacle for you, I really do. But CB extends to plants, inverts and societies in a way that extends far beyond F&W. I really think that it should be used to brand an interdepartmental program and not a department. Sorry...

Brenda McComb, Professor and Head
Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society
321B Richardson Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331 Phone: 541-737-6583 Fax: 541-737-5814
A virtuous person promotes agreement. A person without virtue promotes blame. -Lao Tzu
+-------------------------------------------------------------+

From: Thompson, Greg
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2009 8:13 AM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW

Hi Dan,

I saw the push-back from both Hal and Larry. In my opinion, Hal is saying that we should not move forward on anything during these times of change. In other words, don’t try to improve your programs/department because we are going through divisional, departmental, etc. changes. Larry’s feedback sounds like the College of Science feels they OWN the word biological, and that change is happening too fast to be offering another change – a name change. Both are not sound reasons for your name change. I feel that you, your department, and stakeholders know what is best for your department and the name change. I say go forth young man, go forth.

Greg Thompson, PhD
Professor & Department Head
From: Patricia Muir [muirp@science.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2009 12:31 PM
To: Flick, Larry; Salwasser, Hal
Cc: Edge, W. Daniel - FW; Bloomer, Sherman - COS; Abbott, Mark
Richard; Duncan, Robert Ames; Harte, Michael James; CAS
Dept Heads; Jensen, Edward C.; McComb, Brenda; Maness,
Thomas; McLain, Tom; Doescher, Paul; McMurray, David;
Kaplan, Jonathan; Lunch, William; Gallagher, Sally; Bray,
Tammy; Rodgers, Lawrence; Arp, Dan; Clarke, Cyril; Mason,
Robert - Biology; Karplus, Andy; Wolf, Aaron; Wright, Dawn;
Garity, Dennis - MATH; Jansen, Henri; Beatty, Joe; Menge,
Bruce; Dowhower, Dan; Coakley, Stella - CAS; Muir, Patricia
Subject: RE: Curriculum Liaison--Name Change Proposal--response
requested by 15 Jan.

Dear Dan et al.,

I am sorry to say that I too agree with Hal’s point. I also have a
concern about the proposed name. It implies that this department is “the”
home for conservation biology research and teaching at OSU, which isn’t
the case. If a name change were to be pursued, even a subtle shift
such as “Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology” would, in my view,
be an improvement, as it makes clear that the conservation biology aspect
of the unit is tied to fisheries and wildlife issues.

Sorry – I really don’t mean to be cantankerous!

Pat Muir
Professor, Botany and Plant Pathology
Director, Environmental Sciences Undergraduate Program

From: Michael Harte [mharte@coas.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Saturday, December 12, 2009 11:55 AM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: Re: Curriculum Liaison--Name Change Proposal--response
requested by 15 Jan.

Dear Dan,

The name change has the support of the Marine Resource Management Program.

Regards

Michael Harte
Professor & Director,
Although Sociology is only tangentially affected by the proposed name change, it does seem reasonable to consider the ways in which the change may be premature (given realignments) or adversely affect other programs whose focus is also in the areas of biology and/or conservation.

Sally Gallagher

Second Liaison Request and Responses

Please see the message from the Curriculum Council below about the proposal to rename “Fisheries and Wildlife” to “Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology.” They want to see responses to our proposal from you guys. Please provide me with a response by 31 March. The attached revised Cat I proposal has my response to folks who objected earlier to the proposal starting on page 32. As an aside, the CAS transformation plan to be released on Friday will have the new name in it—I am not sure if that proposal overrides our proposal or what.

I appreciate your response whether it is supportive or not.

Cheers,

Dan

From: Dowhower, Dan
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:33 AM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Cc: Leslie, Susie; Loveland, Walter D - ONID; Brown, Carol - COB; Fisk, Martin
Subject: additional feedback regarding the rename of FW

Dan,

I had a great conversation with Marty Fisk this morning regarding the rename of FW. In that conversation we reviewed the liaison section of the document and were concerned about gaps due to non-response with the larger concern being how this might impact the proposal as it moves forward. Specifically, the recommendation would be to attempt to connect with the following folks who either did not respond or were not asked:

1. Paul Doescher
2. Linda Ciuffetti
3. Mike Borman
4. Joe Beatty
5. Andy Blaustein

Given how chaotic the university has been in response to the budget crisis, it is probably in the best interest of the proposal to have a documented response rather than suggesting no response means agreement.

Thanks and please let me know if there is anything I can do to help out!

Cheers,

Dan

Dan Dowhower
Academic Planning and Assessment Coordinator
500 Kerr Administration Building
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-2109
Phone: (541) 737-9544
Fax: (541) 737-8082
dan.dowhower@oregonstate.edu

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

From: Joe Beatty [beattyj@science.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:18 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Hi Dan,

Zoology has no problem with your proposal to rename “Fisheries and Wildlife to “Fisheries and Wildlife, and Conservation Biology.” Please
let me know if you need a more detailed response from Zoology. I’m on my way out of the office now and won’t be back until 28 March.

Best of luck with this. It seems like a “no brainer” to me.

Joe

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

From: Andy Blaustein [blaustea@science.oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:19 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: Re: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Dan,

My official response is: "I support the name change" for many of the reasons outlined in your proposal. I agree that The Fisheries and Wildlife Department is traditionally conservation oriented probably more so than other units (including zoology) on campus.

Unofficially I too wonder about the timing with all the changes occurring on campus and the fact that many other units have Conservation Biologists.

Additional text on graduate faculty appointment unrelated to name change was deleted.

Good luck with the name change and let me know if I can help.

Andy

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

From: Borman, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:18 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Dan,

The proposed name seems to reflect the curriculum and focus of the department. The CAS Transformation plan proposes the name change. I approve.

Mike Borman
Department Head and Extension Specialist
Dept. of Rangeland Ecology & Management
Tel: 541-737-1614
Fax: 541-737-0504
michael.borman@oregonstate.edu
Hi Dan,

I believe you mentioned to the group that we had a conversation regarding the name change for F&W. As I mentioned to you during our conversation, it is important that a name change doesn't preclude BPP or discussions going on with the Plant Sciences group on campus from offering an option within a "plant science major" that includes conservation biology and/or restoration ecology. As others have pointed out in their responses, these types of emphases are important for the plant sciences units on campus.

Thank you for all the liaison and discussion that you have had with the group.

Best regards,

Lynda Ciuffetti

Hi Dan--I tried to send you a response yesterday from Canada, but although it appeared to send, today I notice it was not in my sent box.

Basically in that message I indicated that I was OK with either Conservation Biology or Conservation Science added to the Department name. However, I prefer Conservation Science--I think it avoids some of the concerns expressed over Conservation Biology but still conveys an excellent representation of all the good work done in your Department.

Paragraph on college names deleted.

Hope this helps and let me know, I will be back in town tomorrow afternoon.

Paul Doescher

3/25/2010

Dan

SCB definition is not the meaning of the word conservation. Their definition would support a Society for Preservation Biology. TWS, AFS, SAF do conservation biology.

Hal

Dan

Sorry for the delay in responding.
From The Society for Conservation Biology's own website: "The definition of Conservation Biology that we are using is the one supplied by the Society for Conservation Biology, as described in The Society's journal. Applying this description to our site: "We will provide information on programs that are attempting to develop the scientific and technical means for the protection, maintenance, and restoration of life on this planet - its species, its ecological and evolutionary processes, and its particular and total environment." see: http://www.conbio.org/resources/Programs/About/faq.cfm Much more detail on what is included in this definition is available in that professional society's strategic plan (http://www.conbio.org/AboutUs/StrategicPlan/2006/). Given the breadth of expertise needed to adequately address this definition, including the biotic and abiotic components of environments, it seems incomprehensible to me that any one department could legitimately claim that name. The social sciences, economics, ecosystem sciences, political sciences, as well as taxonomic disciplines spanning the plant and animal kingdoms all address this profession. I have been a member of the Society for Conservation Biology for years and served on the Editorial Board and the manuscripts that I reviewed spanned all of these areas of expertise. Clearly many people in the Fisheries and Wildlife are indeed directly involved in addressing conservation biology issues. So are people in Forest Ecosystems and Society and Botany and Plant Pathology; and the undergraduate and graduate curricula offered in Natural Resources also address the training of our students in various aspects of this profession.

My suggestion to you is to consider a name such as Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Science. That is, the conservation of terrestrial and aquatic organisms in which you train students and conduct research with others across campus who, with you, provide important expertise in the broader Conservation Biology profession with regards to ecosystem process (e.g., climate change, nutrient cycling, energy flow), social and political systems and taxonomic determinations. Indeed it is this synergy among these disciplines that will be needed to address contemporary conservation problems and should be the basis for an interdepartmental and intercollegiate graduate degree program in Conservation Biology.

Brenda McComb

Hi Dan,

I cannot support renaming to include the words conservation biology for reasons previously explained. I could support Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology and Management, which I think is a more accurate description.

Hal Salwasser

From: Tesch, Steve
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 10:55 AM
To: Gregory, Stanley V; Edge, W. Daniel
Cc: Robinson, Douglas; Ciuffetti, Lynda; McComb, Brenda; Doescher, Paul; Maness, Thomas
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Paragraph on his experience with trying to rename Forest Engineering a few years ago was deleted.....
I have not been involved in the liaison on this proposal, so forgive me if I am plowing old ground. As I read your emails below it struck me that the proposal might be more broadly embraced if it was clearer that the focus was on fisheries and wildlife conservation biology or whatever. Your statement about that intent seems inconsistent with the terminology that Dan is using that states fisheries, wildlife, AND conservation biology. I think it is easier for others who have an active interest/stake in this discipline to feel that threatened by that “AND” wording. Is there alternative wording to make the intentions your state more clear?

Best wishes for working this out. We do want OSU to have a strong identity as a leader in conservation biology, science, and management.

Steve

+---------------------------------------------+

From: Doescher, Paul
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 10:03 AM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Cc: Robinson, Douglas - FW; Gregory, Stanley V - FW
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Dan-as you know, Conservation Biology is near and dear to my heart. Somehow and somewhere at OSU, we need a Conservation Biology Program that draws on the many strengths that exist in this area. These strengths span many departments across several colleges.

I have heard the proposed name change is causing some individuals significant concerns.

One factor that could help me in regard to your proposal (and endorsing it or not) is to hear how others individuals and departments are responding. If there are significant concerns, my suggestion would be to convene key individuals involved in Conservation Biology efforts to discuss how best to promote this area at Oregon State University. I think basically it is a question of affirming the efforts in Conservation Biology and creating collaboration rather than divisiveness. One thought is to create an interdisciplinary, cross-unit degree program that would bring individuals together. This effort could be spearheaded by Fisheries and Wildlife.

Paul

+---------------------------------------------+

From: Edge, W. Daniel - FW
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 5:54 PM
To: Gregory, Stanley V - FW; Doescher, Paul
Cc: Robinson, Douglas - FW; Ciuffetti, Lynda; McComb, Brenda
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Paul,
I am attaching two documents for your review. The first (Responses to Liaison with Other Units.doc) is our response to the concerns expressed during the first liaison request—you might have looked at this already, but I am assuming you did not. The second document (Liaison Responses Part 2.doc) are the responses I have received from 3 of the 5 people that the curriculum council asked me to specifically ask. I had a conversation with Lynda Ciuffetti on Thursday and she said that her response was likely to be support conditioned on the assumption that the name change would not prevent any interdisciplinary degree or degree options in their program related to restoration and conservation. That of course has never been our intent. In fact, Brenda McComb and I have discussed beginning work on an interdisciplinary MS in Conservation Biology and has presented in some of the draft documents regarding aligning natural resources at OSU.

Let me know what you think; if you would like have a cup of coffee to discuss this, I would be glad to meet with.

Cheers,

Dan

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

From: McComb, Brenda
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 8:01 PM
To: Edge, W. Daniel - FW; Gregory, Stanley V - FW; Doescher, Paul
Cc: Robinson, Douglas - FW; Ciuffetti, Lynda; Tesch, Steve
Subject: RE: I need your feedback regarding the renaming of Fisheries and Wildlife by 31 March

Dan et al.

I still have concerns about F&W usurping this name; many OSU departments are involved in Conservation Biology. I am preparing a more detailed response to your proposal, but I do agree with Paul's suggestion of convening all of those on campus involved in that discipline to discuss an appropriate approach to bringing recognition to OSU. I am sure that there must be a less divisive approach to allow OSU to be recognized for all of the good things that so many departments do in this discipline.

Brenda

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Hi Dan,

I cannot support renaming to include the words conservation biology for reasons previously explained. I could support Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Biology and Management, which I think is a more accurate description.

Hal Salwasser