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Additional review comments or suggestions for the Department:
This was a thoughtful and complete self-assessment of the department's 8 degrees in which both strengths and weaknesses within the department were identified and discussed. The department excels at mentoring and management of its programs. It would have been useful for the department to identify and discuss what other programs on campus contribute to the viability of WILD's graduate programs.
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Additional review comments or suggestions for the Department

The effort put in to the self-study is appreciated and I trust it has benefited the department.

The eight degree programs range across broad areas. Practices across the department are quite similar and generally effective, many drawing on the excellent model of the Ecology center for recruiting and mentoring. Funding is a common issue.

The self-studies did not refer (or if they did I missed it) to any connections with other departments or colleges at USU. I would imagine that there are students who take courses in other departments (e.g. WATS, BIOL, PSC) and hence interdependencies among these departments and programs. What is done to coordinate these? How are they managed? Do other departments know of dependencies your department has on them? Do you know of other departments that depend on your courses?
Review of Graduate Degree Program Self-Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Wildland Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>PhD/MS Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Graduate Program Self-Study reviews focus on the four critical components:
- Recruiting
- Mentoring
- Management
- Funding

The practices in each critical component for this degree program are rated as one of the following:
- **Excellent** – Highly effective practices that yield outstanding results
- **Satisfactory** – Generally effective practices that yield acceptable outcomes
- **Needs Improvement** – Practices and outcomes are insufficient to meet program objectives

Comments are provided, including the identification of best practices and specific suggestions for improvement, as appropriate.
Recruiting
Recruiting criteria include, but are not limited to, academic preparedness (GPA, standardized test scores, prerequisite degrees); diversity (gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship); number of applied/admitted/enrolled students

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Too superficial to understand strengths and weaknesses.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement

Mentoring
Mentoring criteria include, but are not limited to, preparation for future career; scholarly development; professional community participation; appreciation for diversity; collaborative opportunities

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Too superficial to understand strengths and weaknesses.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
Management
Management data and criteria include, but are not limited to, the faculty and their scholarship, opportunities for and placement of graduates; average time to degree completion; degree completion rates; frequency of course offerings; graduate enrollment numbers (headcount and FTE); retention; number of degrees conferred; credit requirements; specializations offered; faculty resources

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Too superficial to understand strengths and weaknesses.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
**Funding**

Funding criteria include, but are not limited to, funding sources (departmental, institutional, contracts, grants); percentage of students receiving support via tuition awards, assistantships, fellowships; average level and duration of support; selection process for tuition awards, fellowships, assistantships.

**Rating**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**

Too superficial to understand strengths and weaknesses.

**Best Practices Identified**

---

**Suggestions for Improvement**

---
Overall

Important aspects in the review of this graduate degree program that have not been captured above:
Review of Graduate Degree Program Self-Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Wildland Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>PhD/MS Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Graduate Program Self-Study reviews focus on the four critical components:

- Recruiting
- Mentoring
- Management
- Funding

The practices in each critical component for this degree program are rated as one of the following:

- **Excellent** – Highly effective practices that yield outstanding results
- **Satisfactory** – Generally effective practices that yield acceptable outcomes
- **Needs Improvement** – Practices and outcomes are insufficient to meet program objectives

Comments are provided, including the identification of best practices and specific suggestions for improvement, as appropriate.

*This review combines PhD and MS programs.*
## Recruiting

Recruiting criteria include, but are not limited to, academic preparedness (GPA, standardized test scores, prerequisite degrees); diversity (gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship); number of applied/admitted/enrolled students.

### Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Comments

The department uses a mix of recruiting strategies to attract high-quality applicants. Recruitment is primarily limited by the amount of support the department can offer students.

### Best Practices Identified


### Suggestions for Improvement


Mentoring
Mentoring criteria include, but are not limited to, preparation for future career; scholarly development; professional community participation; appreciation for diversity; collaborative opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Data were sparse because of the low number of students, but students pursuing this degree do not seem to be as active in presenting and publishing their research as other graduate students in this department.

Best Practices Identified
Excellent mix of one-on-one and group activities to develop work ethic, enhance technical knowledge, improve science communication skills, develop networking skills, and providing opportunities for honing leadership skills. The highly social interactions between faculty and students minimize barriers.

Suggestions for Improvement
Management
Management data and criteria include, but are not limited to, the faculty and their scholarship, opportunities for and placement of graduates; average time to degree completion; degree completion rates; frequency of course offerings; graduate enrollment numbers (headcount and FTE); retention; number of degrees conferred; credit requirements; specializations offered; faculty resources

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
About 6 faculty contribute to this degree. They obtain reasonable amounts of extramural funding, but they are significantly less productive than the rest of the department. Over the 3 years of data, 0.7 PhD students and 3+ MS students were pursuing Forestry degrees each year.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
This degree option does not have strong enrollments and this time and the department should consider whether the program is needed, and if so, how to revitalize the degree.
Funding
Funding criteria include, but are not limited to, funding sources (departmental, institutional, contracts, grants); percentage of students receiving support via tuition awards, assistantships, fellowships; average level and duration of support; selection process for tuition awards, fellowships, assistantships

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>Satisfactory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Funding for individual students is adequate and significantly higher than the university average.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement

Overall

Important aspects in the review of this graduate degree program that have not been captured above:
Review of Graduate Degree Program Self-Study

Department
Wildland Resources
Degree Program
PhD/MS Range Science

X Reviewer 1
Reviewer 2

The Graduate Program Self-Study reviews focus on the four critical components:
- Recruiting
- Mentoring
- Management
- Funding

The practices in each critical component for this degree program are rated as one of the following:
- Excellent – Highly effective practices that yield outstanding results
- Satisfactory – Generally effective practices that yield acceptable outcomes
- Needs Improvement – Practices and outcomes are insufficient to meet program objectives

Comments are provided, including the identification of best practices and specific suggestions for improvement, as appropriate.

This review combines PhD and MS programs. Comments on this degree option are similar to those for the Wildlife and Ecology degrees except for Management.
Recruiting

Recruiting criteria include, but are not limited to, academic preparedness (GPA, standardized test scores, prerequisite degrees); diversity (gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship); number of applied/admitted/enrolled students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
The department uses a mix of recruiting strategies to attract high-quality applicants. Recruitment is primarily limited by the amount of support the department can offer students.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
Mentoring
Mentoring criteria include, but are not limited to, preparation for future career; scholarly development; professional community participation; appreciation for diversity; collaborative opportunities.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Students are active in presenting and publishing their research while enrolled in the program.

Best Practices Identified
Excellent mix of one-on-one and group activities to develop work ethic, enhance technical knowledge, improve science communication skills, develop networking skills, and providing opportunities for honing leadership skills. The highly social interactions between faculty and students minimize barriers.

Suggestions for Improvement
Management
Management data and criteria include, but are not limited to, the faculty and their scholarship, opportunities for and placement of graduates; average time to degree completion; degree completion rates; frequency of course offerings; graduate enrollment numbers (headcount and FTE); retention; number of degrees conferred; credit requirements; specializations offered; faculty resources

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
About 9 faculty contribute to this degree. These faculty are generally up to date in their fields, successful in obtaining extramural funding, and publish frequently and in high-quality journals. About 2 PhD students and 12 MS students pursue Range Science degrees each year.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
The MS program appears to be healthy, but the PhD program in Range Science has minimal enrollment and the department should consider if the PhD program is viable. There appears to be sufficient numbers of faculty but most Range oriented PhD students appear to pursue Ecology degrees.
Funding
Funding criteria include, but are not limited to, funding sources (departmental, institutional, contracts, grants); percentage of students receiving support via tuition awards, assistantships, fellowships; average level and duration of support; selection process for tuition awards, fellowships, assistantships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments
Funding for students is adequate and significantly higher than the university average. However, the growth of the program is limited by both the number of students that can be supported with available funds and the salaries and tuition waivers that can be applied to individual students.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
Overall

Important aspects in the review of this graduate degree program that have not been captured above:
Review of Graduate Degree Program Self-Study

Department | Wildland Resources
Degree Program | PhD/MS Wildlife

|     | Reviewer 1
|-----|-----
| X   |     
|     | Reviewer 2

The Graduate Program Self-Study reviews focus on the four critical components:
- Recruiting
- Mentoring
- Management
- Funding

The practices in each critical component for this degree program are rated as one of the following:
- **Excellent** – Highly effective practices that yield outstanding results
- **Satisfactory** – Generally effective practices that yield acceptable outcomes
- **Needs Improvement** – Practices and outcomes are insufficient to meet program objectives

Comments are provided, including the identification of best practices and specific suggestions for improvement, as appropriate.

This review combines PhD and MS programs. Comments on this degree option are essentially identical to that for the Ecology degrees.
Recruiting

Recruiting criteria include, but are not limited to, academic preparedness (GPA, standardized test scores, prerequisite degrees); diversity (gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship); number of applied/admitted/enrolled students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments

The department uses a mix of recruiting strategies to attract high-quality applicants. Recruitment is primarily limited by the amount of support the department can offer students.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
Mentoring

Mentoring criteria include, but are not limited to, preparation for future career; scholarly development; professional community participation; appreciation for diversity; collaborative opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments

Students are active in presenting and publishing their research while enrolled in the program.

Best Practices Identified

Excellent mix of one-on-one and group activities to develop work ethic, enhance technical knowledge, improve science communication skills, develop networking skills, and providing opportunities for honing leadership skills. The highly social interactions between faculty and students minimize barriers.

Suggestions for Improvement
**Management**

Management data and criteria include, but are not limited to, the faculty and their scholarship, opportunities for and placement of graduates; average time to degree completion; degree completion rates; frequency of course offerings; graduate enrollment numbers (headcount and FTE); retention; number of degrees conferred; credit requirements; specializations offered; faculty resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**

About 20 faculty contribute to this degree. These faculty are up to date in their fields, successful in obtaining extramural funding, and publish frequently and in high-quality journals. About 12 PhD students and 16 MS students pursue Wildlife degrees each year.

**Best Practices Identified**

The department has been successful at finishing students in a timely manner, which is especially commendable given the national average time PhD students take to complete degrees. It is not clear what specific practices result in this outcome.

**Suggestions for Improvement**
Funding

Funding criteria include, but are not limited to, funding sources (departmental, institutional, contracts, grants); percentage of students receiving support via tuition awards, assistantships, fellowships; average level and duration of support; selection process for tuition awards, fellowships, assistantships

Rating

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments

Funding for students is adequate and significantly higher than the university average. However, the growth of the program is limited by both the number of students that can be supported with available funds and the salaries and tuition waivers that can be applied to individual students.

Best Practices Identified

Suggestions for Improvement
Overall

Important aspects in the review of this graduate degree program that have not been captured above: