Table of Contents: Tables 6

Table A. Characteristics of 1.) applicants, and 2.) admitted, and 3.) matriculated students

Academic Year			2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total (as applicable)	Trend[6]
1. Applied[1]											
Total number of applications received			**3**	**38**	**36**	**43**	**49**	**44**	**44**	**257**	
Gender (no.)	Male		1	25	19	33	40	29	36	**183**	
	Female		2	13	17	10	8	15	8	**73**	
	Unknown		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	
Citizenship[2] (no.)	Domestic		2	28	22	32	34	33	34	**185**	
	International		1	10	14	11	15	11	10	**72**	
Race/Ethnicity (no.)	Asian/Pacific Islander		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**2**	
	Hispanic		0	0	1	1	1	0	1	**4**	
	White		2	26	19	28	24	32	31	**162**	
	Black		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	American Indian/Alaskan Native		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Persons reporting two or more races		0	1	1	1	1	0	1	**5**	
	International (added by FERM)*				14	11	15	11	10	**61**	
	Unknown*		1	9	1	2	8	1	1	**23**	
Degree (no.)	Master's		2	32	29	32	36	36	36	**203**	
	Doctoral		1	6	7	11	13	8	8	**54**	
Incoming GPA	Average		3.3	3.53	3.44	3.54	3.52	3.48	3.44	**3.5**	
	High		3.6	3.99	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	**3.9**	
	Low		2.86	2.47	2.43	2.6	2.78	2.75	2.58	**2.6**	
GRE Scores (or equivalent, i.e. GMAT) Table A	Combined	N	3	38	35	34	47	43	43	**34.7**	
		Average	301	305	307	310	308	311	312	**307.6**	
		High	326	323	334	332	333	334	328	**330.0**	
		Low	281	279	283	283	267	280	287	**280.0**	
	Verbal	N	3	38	35	34	47	43	43	**34.7**	
		Average	146	153	154	155	154	155	157	**153.5**	
		High	161	164	169	170	169	170	169	**167.4**	
		Low	138	137	133	136	130	130	140	**134.9**	
	Quantitative	N	3	38	35	34	47	43	43	**34.7**	
		Average	145	153	153	155	153	156	155	**152.8**	
		High	165	166	165	170	165	166	170	**166.7**	
		Low	141	134	138	144	137	141	144	**139.9**	
	Analytical Writing	N	3	38	35	34	47	43	43	**34.7**	
		Average	3.3	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	**3.7**	
		High	4.5	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	**5.4**	
		Low	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.5	**2.0**	
TOEFL Scores[3] *Excludes IELTS exam scores*	Combined	N	1	9	10	10	5	5	7	**6.7**	
		Average	95	84	82	88	76	84	93	**85.9**	
		High	95	100	103	110	92	94	105	**99.9**	
		Low	95	63	58	67	46	54	82	**66.4**	
2. Admitted[4]											
Total number of admitted students			**3**	**32**	**23**	**28**	**31**	**31**	**30**	**178**	
Gender (no.)	Male		1	21	13	22	24	21	23	**125**	
	Female		2	11	10	6	7	10	7	**53**	
	Unknown		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
Citizenship[2] (no.)	Domestic		2	23	17	22	24	26	24	**138**	
	International		1	9	6	6	7	5	6	**40**	
Race/Ethnicity (no.)	Asian/Pacific Islander		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**2**	
	Hispanic		0	0	1	1	1	0	1	**4**	
	White		2	21	15	21	18	26	21	**124**	
	Black		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	American Indian/Alaskan Native		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Persons reporting two or more races		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**2**	
	International (added by FERM)*				6	6	6	5	6	**29**	
	Unknown		1	8	1	0	6	0	1	**17**	
Degree (no.)	Master's		2	26	18	21	22	24	25	**138**	
	Doctoral		1	6	5	7	9	7	5	**40**	
Incoming GPA	Average		3.3	3.61	3.51	3.54	3.6	3.54	3.5	**4**	
	High		3.6	3.99	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	**4**	
	Low		2.86	2.63	2.43	2.73	2.78	3.03	2.58	**3**	
GRE Scores (or equivalent, i.e. GMAT)	Combined	N	3	32	23	28	31	31	30	**25**	
		Average	301	307	311	311	313	315	313	**310**	
		High	326	323	334	332	333	334	328	**330**	
		Low	281	279	283	283	294	288	292	**286**	
	Verbal	N	3	32	23	28	31	31	30	**25**	
		Average	146	153	157	156	157	158	157	**155**	
		High	161	164	169	170	169	170	168	**167**	
		Low	138	137	140	136	142	138	143	**139**	
	Quantitative	N	3	32	23	28	31	31	30	**25**	
		Average	145	154	154	156	156	157	156	**154**	
		High	165	166	165	170	165	166	170	**167**	
		Low	141	134	139	144	146	141	144	**141**	
	Analytical Writing	N	3	32	23	28	31	31	30	**25**	
		Average	3.3	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	**4**	
		High	4.5	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	**5**	
		Low	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	**2**	
TOEFL Scores[3] *Excludes IELTS exam scores*	Combined	N	1	8	5	5	2	4	6	**4**	
		Average	95	86	89	86	79	91	95	**89**	
		High	95	100	103	107	84	94	105	**98**	
		Low	95	63	80	67	74	84	84	**78**	
3. Matriculated[5]											

Table A. Characteristics of 1.) applicants, and 2.) admitted, and 3.) matriculated students

Academic Year			2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total (as applicable)	Trend[6]
Total number of matriculated students			**3**	**22**	**15**	**17**	**19**	**22**	**17**	**115**	
Gender (no.)	Male		1	15	9	16	14	13	12	**80**	
	Female		2	7	6	1	5	9	5	**35**	
	Unknown		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
Citizenship[2] (no.)	Domestic		2	18	10	13	16	20	14	**93**	
	International		1	4	5	4	3	2	3	**22**	
Race/Ethnicity (no.)	Asian/Pacific Islander		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Hispanic		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	**2**	
	White		2	17	9	13	11	20	13	**85**	
	Black		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	American Indian/Alaskan Native		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Persons reporting two or more races		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**2**	
	International (added by FERM)*				5	4	3	2	3	**17**	
	Unknown		1	4	0	0	4	0	0	**9**	
Degree (no.)	Master's		2	18	12	13	14	18	14	**91**	
	Doctoral		1	4	3	4	5	4	3	**24**	
Incoming GPA	Average		3.3	3.63	3.43	3.49	3.62	3.55	3.48	**4**	
	High		3.6	3.99	4	4	4	4	4	**4**	
	Low		2.86	2.63	2.43	2.73	3.13	3.03	2.58	**3**	
GRE Scores (or equivalent, i.e. GMAT)	Combined	N	3	22	15	17	19	22	17	**16**	
		Average	301	307	305	311	316	315	313	**310**	
		High	326	323	324	332	333	329	327	**328**	
		Low	281	283	283	283	300	288	294	**287**	
	Verbal	N	3	22	15	17	19	22	17	**16**	
		Average	146	154	154	156	159	159	157	**155**	
		High	161	164	165	170	169	169	166	**166**	
		Low	138	138	140	136	148	140	148	**141**	
	Quantitative	N	3	22	15	17	19	22	17	**16**	
		Average	145	153	152	155	157	156	155	**153**	
		High	165	162	161	170	165	164	170	**165**	
		Low	141	134	139	144	146	141	144	**141**	
	Analytical Writing	N	3	22	15	17	19	22	17	**16**	
		Average	3.3	4.1	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7	**4**	
		High	4.5	6.0	5.0	4.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	**5**	
		Low	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	**2**	
TOEFL Scores[3] *Excludes IELTS exam scores*	Combined	N	1	3	4	4	1	1	3	**2**	
		Average	95	89	89	87	74	94	95	**89**	
		High	95	95	103	107	74	94	97	**95**	
		Low	95	80	80	67	74	94	94	**83**	
Ratio of Matriculated to Applied											
Degree	Total		**100%**	**58%**	**42%**	**40%**	**39%**	**50%**	**39%**		
	Master's		100%	56%	41%	62%	39%	50%	39%		
	Doctoral		100%	67%	43%	36%	38%	50%	38%		
Ratio of Admitted to Applied											
Degree	Total		**100%**	**84%**	**64%**	**65%**	**63%**	**70%**	**68%**		
	Master's		100%	81%	62%	66%	61%	67%	69%		
	Doctoral		100%	100%	71%	64%	69%	88%	63%		
Ratio of Matriculated to Admitted											
Degree	Total		**100%**	**69%**	**65%**	**61%**	**61%**	**71%**	**57%**		
	Master's		100%	69%	67%	62%	64%	75%	56%		
	Doctoral		100%	67%	60%	57%	56%	57%	60%		

Notes:

Includes the following major code(s): 1090

1. "Applied" means all applications indicating this major, including complete and incomplete applications

2. Citizenship is based on Non-Resident Alien Status (international)

3. TOEFL Paper and Computer Scores were converted to Internet based scores using TOEFL Score Comparison Tables. Due to the lack of Total Computer and Paper Based Test Scores in Data Warehouse- only section scores are provided for students who took the Internet based version.

4. "Admitted" means admit codes A, AY, CA for this major code

5. "Matriculated" means all those admits (see above) who enrolled in summer, fall, winter, and spring terms at OSU; also includes transfer students

*Beginning (2014), "declined to respond" international students were separated from counts (because their applications are automatically marked "declined...")

[6] Trend Data: correlation coefficient formula used

ND = No Data Available

Table B. Characteristics of enrolled students.

FALL TERM		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total (as applicable)	Trend€
Total number of enrolled students		**1**	**20**	**38**	**41**	**45**	**51**	**55**	**250**	
Gender (no.)	Male	1	15	23	30	37	39	38	**182**	
	Female	0	5	14	10	7	11	16	**63**	
	Self-Identified	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		
Citizenship[1] (no.)	Domestic	1	17	28	31	33	39	46	**194**	
	International	0	3	10	10	12	13	9	**57**	
Oregon Residency (no.)	Resident	1	6	11	11	9	8	13	**58**	
	Non-Resident	0	14	27	30	36	43	42	**192**	
Primary Campus of Student (no.)	Corvallis	1	20	38	41	45	51	55	**250**	
	Ecampus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Cascades	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
Race/Ethnicity (no.)	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Hispanic	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	**6**	
	White	1	16	26	29	28	33	41	**173**	
	Black	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Persons reporting two or more races	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	**4**	
	International (added by FERM)*				10	12	12	9	**43**	
	Unknown	0	3	10	0	4	4	3	**24**	
Degree (no.)*	Master of Science	1	16	26	25	25	27	30	**149**	
	Master of Forestry	0	1	4	6	6	6	9	**32**	
	Doctor of Philosophy	0	3	8	10	14	18	16	**69**	

Notes:

Enrollment data includes degree seeking students in the following major codes: 1090)

1. Citizenship is based on Non-Resident Alien Status (International)

€ Trend Data: correlation coefficient formula used

*Beginning Fall 2014, "declined to respond" international students were separated from counts (because their applications were automatically marked "declined…")

Table C. Financial support for graduate students - SFM, FE, and FR majors only

FALL TERM (assistantships)			2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total (as applicable)	Trend[c]
Total Number of Majors Funded			**20**	**21**	**21**	**21**	**29**	**33**	**30**	**28**	**28**	**29**	**203**	
Percent of Total Majors funded by GRA/GTA			51%	53%	64%	53%	74%	72%	57%	60%	57%	56%		
Funding Source (no.)	Within Program*		20	20	21	21	28	32	29	27	28	29		
	Outside of Program		0	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0		
Assistantship Type (no.)	GRA		20	20	21	21	29	33	30	27	28	29		
	GTA		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
Degree (no.)**	Master's		7	13	15	16	21	26	23	19	19	18		
	Doctoral		13	8	6	5	8	7	7	9	9	11		
FTE (no.)	.20 - .39 FTE		3	6	9	5	8	12	8	5	4	5		
	.40 - .49 FTE		17	15	12	16	21	21	22	23	24	24		
GRA Monthly Salaries ($), adjusted to a .49 FTE	Master's	Maximum	$ 1,589	$ 1,653	$ 1,736	$ 1,736	$ 1,788	$ 1,788	$ 1,788	$ 1,806	$ 1,824	$ 1,861		
		Minimum	$ 1,589	$ 1,653	$ 1,736	$ 1,736	$ 1,788	$ 1,736	$ 1,770	$ 1,788	$ 1,824	$ 1,861		
		Median	$ 1,589	$ 1,653	$ 1,736	$ 1,736	$ 1,788	$ 1,788	$ 1,788	$ 1,788	$ 1,824	$ 1,861		
	Doctoral	Maximum	$ 1,701	$ 1,720	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,964	$ 2,004		
		Minimum	$ 1,701	$ 1,720	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,964	$ 2,004		
		Median	$ 1,701	$ 1,720	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,806	$ 1,964	$ 2,004		
GTA Monthly Salaries ($), adjusted to a .49FTE	Master's	Maximum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		Minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		Median	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	Doctoral	Maximum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		Minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		Median	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Students (no.) funded between .20 - .39 FTE for all 3 academic year terms			3	3	6	5	5	7	3	6	0	2		
Students (no.) funded at .40 FTE or above for all 3 academic year terms			15	9	12	14	19	18	17	18	18	22		
ACADEMIC YEAR (awards)[3]			**2007-08**	**2008-09**	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**Total (as applicable)**	**Trend**
Total No. of Fellowships Appointments (Graduate Fellows) awarded[A]			**0**	**7**	**9**	**9**	**7**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**7**	**6**	**44**	
Degree (no.)	Master's			2	4	5	3	2	3	3	5	5	32	
	Doctoral			5	5	4	4	3	1	0	2	1	25	
Fellowship Support administered through the Graduate School ($)	Master's	Total Stipend Monies Paid ($)		$ 26,220.00	$ 55,618.00	$ 51,200.00	$ 57,102.00	$ 40,965.00	$ 50,976.00	$ 13,986.00	$ 40,212.00	$ 71,448.00		
		Total Tuition Waiver Monies Paid ($)		Unavailable	$ 25,623.00	$ 26,424.00	$ 45,873.00	$ 25,191.00	$ 42,525.00	$ 23,814.00	$ 44,550.00	$ 55,847.00		
	Doctoral	Total Stipend Monies Paid ($)		$ 85,965.00	$ 99,279.00	$ 78,375.00	$ 63,811.00	$ 48,211.00	$ 7,137.00	$ -	$ 37,686.00	$ 20,685.00		
		Total Tuition Waiver Monies Paid ($)		Unavailable	$ 53,271.00	$ 43,164.00	$ 43,668.00	$ 31,950.00	$ -	$ -	$ 24,300.00	$ 12,150.00		
Total No. of scholarships/fellowships[1] awarded by the Graduate School[B]			**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**7**	**11**	**7**	**13**	
Degree (no.)	Master's		Unavailable	Unavailable	1	1	1	0	1	4	9	5	22	
	Doctoral		Unavailable	Unavailable	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	2	9	
Total award dollars ($) paid[2]	Master's		Unavailable	Unavailable	$6,000.00	$5,580.00	$11,428.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	$22,505.00	$92,611.00	$34,441.00		
	Doctoral		Unavailable	Unavailable	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$41,979.00	$3,250.00	$39,557.00	$46,150.00	$43,150.00		
Total No. of financial awards from other sources[C]			**0**	**0**	**10**	**5**	**13**	**29**	**41**	**18**	**37**	**37**	**116**	
Degree (no.)	Master's		Unavailable	Unavailable	4	4	6	15	27	11	20	24	111	
	Doctoral		Unavailable	Unavailable	6	1	7	14	14	7	17	13	79	
Total award dollars ($) paid[2]	Master's		Unavailable	Unavailable	$3,675.00	$19,500.00	$15,055.00	$17,776.50	$28,871.97	$30,600.00	$68,879.59	$31,551.44		
	Doctoral		Unavailable	Unavailable	$10,032.00	$2,500.00	$9,170.00	$24,058.50	$17,796.65	$22,918.15	$43,901.78	$33,757.23		

Notes:

*"Within Program" is defind as majors funded by TS-Org Codes: 231100, 231300, 231600

** Students are counted as Doctoral if they are pursuing a doctorate in any major during the specified term.

Please see the "Explanations" tab for full data definitions regarding assistantship calculations

A."Fellowship Appointments" are those students in this major with a C97% position and job title "Graduate Fellow". These are unduplicated counts of individual students reported on this line.

B. "Fellowships/Scholarships awarded by the Graduate School" are all award monies awarded by the Graduate School and received by students in this major. These are counts of awards; an individual student may hold more than one award. Awards in this catageory includes: Yerex Graduate Fellowship, Lenore Bayley Gradaute Fellowship, SYLFF Oregon Fellowship for International Research, Thurogood Marshall Graduate Scholarship, Graduate Diversity Recruitment Bonus, Oregon Lottery Gradaute Scholarship, Englund Memorial Postgraduate Scholarship, Sethi Graduate Scholarship, Frolander Award for Outstanding GTA, Flyfisher's Club of Oregon Gradaute Scholarship, Delson Bridge to the Future Fund, Diversity Scholar Recruitment Award, Oregon Graduate Laurels Block Grants, and other misc. current or past awards administered by the Graduate School.

C. "Financial awards from other sources" include all other scholarhips/fellowship awards (i.e., non-loans) not-delineated in the rows above and received by students in this major. Sources may include department and program awards, other university awards, and external awards, as avaliable through central systems and accounts payable. These are counts of awards; an individual student may hold more than one award

1. Fellowship awards included in these rows are not the same as formal graduate fellowship appointments, delineated in the rows above. Thus, the fellowship data reported in Table C does not include duplicate counts.

2. Includes both award dollars and tuition waiver/relief dollars, as applicable

3. Summer funding not included in academic year financial summaries

[c] Trend Data: correlation coefficient formula used

ND = No Data Available

Table D. Characteristics of graduate courses[±] (standalone, combined undergraduate and graduate [slash], and total offered)

Stand-Alone (G) Graduate Courses Taught by FERM Faculty

Course #	Course Name	Current Instructor	Credits	AY17		AY16		AY15		AY14		AY13		AY12		AY11	
				Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH
FE532	Forest Hydrology	Bladon	4	11	44	7	28	6	24	3	12	14	56			11	44
FE536	Wtshed Impacts of Forest Distr*	Skaugset	4					4	16	1	4			5	15		
FE/BEE545	Sediment Transport	Segura	4			9	27										
FE552	Forest Transportation Systems	Sessions	4			2	8			4	16	2	8	3	12	6	24
FE555	Supply Chain Optimization	Chung	3	2	6	6	18										
FE/CE579	Slope and Embankment Design*	Leshchinsky	3			4	12	18	54								
FE640	St/ Combinatorial Optimization	Sessions	3	3	9	9	27	3	9	4	12	5	15	6	18	6	18
FE640	St/ Harvesting & Transport	Sessions	3											2	6	9	27
FOR518	Managing Forest Nutrition*	Hatten	3	5	15			3	9			5	10				
FOR520	Geospatl Data Analysis W/Matlb*	Hilker	3			10	30	3	9	7	28						
FOR524	Forest Biometrics	Temesgen	3					8	24	9	27			6	18		
FOR525	Forest Modeling	Poudel	3			10	30					10	30				
FOR534	Econ of The Forest Resource	Montgomery	3							9	27			16	48		
FOR546	Wildland Fire Ecology[a]	Bailey	3					9	27	13	39						
FOR549	St/Silvicultural Influences*	Maguire	3	10	30	6	18	10	30								
FOR550	Sustainable Forest Management	Adams	3	25	75	21	63	20	60	18	54	26	78	13	39		
FOR562	Natural Resource Policy & Law	Huntington	3	17	51	25	75	21	63	15	45	24	72	17	51	17	51
FOR563	Envir Policy & Law Interaction	Huntington	3	11	33	10	30	14	42	16	48	13	39	21	63	9	27
FOR599	Managing Soil Carbon	Hatten	3			3	9										
FOR599	St/ Forest Health & Protection*	Shaw	3			11	33	8	24	12	24						
FOR599	St/ Forest Field Health*	Shaw	3	4	12												
FOR599	St/ Fundamentals of Remote Sensing	Strimbu	3	5	15												
FOR599	St/ 3-PG Forest Growth Model	Waring/Gonzalez	2	5	10												
FOR599	St/ Global Restoration Issues	Davis	1	9	9												
FOR599	St/ Advanced Intro to Forest Soils	Hatten	4	1	4												
		Number of Courses		13	38	14	45	13	41	12	39	8	26	9	29	6	20
		Total Enrollment/SCH		108	313	133	408	127	391	111	336	99	308	89	270	58	191

*New course

[a]Taught as Stand Alone After AY 12/13

Slash (g) Courses (4xx/5xx) with Graduate Enrollment Taught by FERM Faculty

Course #	Course Name	Current Instructor	Credits	AY17		AY16		AY15		AY14		AY13		AY12		AY11	
				Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH	Enroll	SCH
FE515	Forest Road Engineering	Kiser	3	2	6	1	3	2	6	5	15					3	9
FE523	UAS Applications	Wing	3	9	27	5	15										
FE530	Watershed Processes	Segura	4			4	16	13	52	5	20						
FE534	Forest Watershed Management	Skaugset	4											9	36	3	12
FE540	Forest Operations Analysis	Chung / Murphy	4	1	4			4	16	3	9					2	6
FE541	Production Planning	Zamora / Murphy	3					1	3	4	12	1	3			3	9
FE547	Tactical & Oper Planning Tech	Sessions														1	3
FE549	Strategic & Tact Plan Techniq	Sessions														1	3
FE550	Forest Operations Design I	Boston														2	6
FE/FOR557	Techniq Forest Resource Analys	Sessions	4			3	12	2	8	5	20	3	12			1	4
FE560	For Oper Regul & Policy Issues	Boston / Adams	3					1	3								
FE570	Logging Mechanics	Sessions	4			2	8			1	4					2	8
FE571	Harvesting Management	Kellogg	3					1	3	1	3			1	3	2	6
FE579	Slope And Embankment Design	Leshchinsky	3					0	0								
FOR513*	Foresth Pathology	LeBoldus	3	2	6												
FOR517	Advanced Forest Soils	Hatten	4					3	12	6	24						
FOR521	Spatial Analy of Forested Lscp	Bailey												10	30		
FOR536	Wildland Fire Science & Mgmt	Bailey	4	5	20	1	8	4	16	6	24	6	24	3	12	6	24
FOR543	Silvicultural Practices	Powers	4	7	28	7	35	2	10	6	30	2	10	2	10	9	45
FOR546	Wildland Fire Ecology*	Bailey	3											7	21	5	15
FOR599	St/ Economics & Policy Forest with Fire	Kuusela	3	3	9												
		Number of Courses with Graduate Enrollment		7	24	7	26	11	36	10	37	4	15	6	18	13	36
		Total Enrollment/SCH		29	100	23	97	33	129	42	161	12	49	32	112	40	150

*New course

Table 6Fa MF Graduate Learning Outcomes

Program:	MF, Sustainable Forest Management
College or Administrative Division:	College of Forestry
Subunit(s)	Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
Report Submitted By:	Dr. John Sessions, Graduate Program Chair and Madison Dudley, Graduate Program Coordinator
Email address:	Madison.dudley@oregonstate.edu
Date Submitted:	
Assessment Period:	
Due Date:	

	University: Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) for Master's students (approved by Faculty Senate on April 14, 2011)			Program Level Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes: University and program level student learning outcome (GLO)	Conduct research or produce some other form of creative work	Demonstrate mastery of subject material	Conduct scholarly or professional activities in an ethical manner	Program level GLO 1: Can Think Critically	Program level GLO 2: Able to Define Project in Area of Concentration	Program level GLO 3: Knowledgeable About Literature	Program level GLO 4: Can Define Contribution of Proposed Project	Program level GLO 5: Can Apply State of the Art Tools	Program level GLO 6: Can Communicate Clearly	Program level GLO 7: Understand Broader Impact of Project Findings	Program level GLO 8: Can Develop a Publication or Outside Presentation	Program level GLO 9: Ethics
Outcomes: What year was this program level learning outcome developed or most recently changed?	NA	NA	NA	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12

Assessment Method												
Assessment Method[1]: List the measures or instruments used to assess each outcome. [How do students demonstrate their attainment of the learning outcome? How is their learning evaluated?] At least one of these must be a direct measure. For additional guidance see: http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources	Final Examination	Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation
Assessment Method: Has this assessment method changed since the last reporting cycle? Yes or No. Explain any changes.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
[1]In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that assessment method remain consistent from year-to-year.												
Benchmark for evaluating satisfactory achievement of learning outcome												

Benchmark*[2]*: What benchmark or milestone - related to the specific measure or instrument - is used to determine whether the outcome has been satisfactorily met by the students?	Project Report / Final Examination	GPA / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination
Benchmark*:* Describe any changes to the benchmark or milestone since the last reporting cycle.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
[2] In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that benchmarks remain consistent from year-to-year.												
Process used for gathering assessment data												
Process*:* Describe the <u>data collection process</u> (e.g., Who is involved? How is the data collected?)	Project Report / Final Examination	GPA / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned

					following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Coordinator for record-keeping	Coordinator for record-keeping	Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Coordinator for record-keeping	to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping
What do the data show about student learning?												
Results: What do the data show about student learning relative to the specific learning outcome? Describe any result, pattern, or trends that you identify as meaningful or that highlights an area(s) of concern or success.	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**
Actions												
Actions: Describe any course-level (content, pedagogical, structural, etc.) changes that are an outgrowth of the current	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

year's assessment of this outcome. Include timelines.												
Actions: Describe any <u>program or degree-level changes</u> that are an outgrowth of the current year's assessment of this outcome. Include timeline.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Full-Cycle Impact												
Full-Cycle impact: If this learning outcome has been assessed previously and is being reported on again this year, what impact have the changes had (if any) on student learning? If you have not previously assessed this learning outcome, please indicate the year you will revisit this outcome.	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website . They are shared with students at beginning of academic program	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination,	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation . Students understand program	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation . Students understand program

					at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.
Process												
Process: Describe the process the program used to reflect on the outcome data.	Graduate Program Chair, SFM Graduate Committee, and Graduate Coordinator review results and present results to faculty at department meeting.											

Process: Were there any challenges or concerns?	Since rubrics are managed within department and not the Graduate School, communication between department and major professors is essential for data collection to be ensured.
Process: How are the results of your assessment effort related to strategic planning and overall program review?	The SFM rubric system was developed in 2012 in consultation with the Graduate School, the graduate faculty committee, and reviewed with graduate faculty. The objective is to understand the skill level of students in the program in each particular dimension of their program. The Rubrics also form the basis for more uniform evaluation of students, a structure to provide feedback to students, and reduce uncertainty of student expectations for the examinations. Our assessment procedure is presented in the 5-year Self-study scheduled for May, 2017 and will be covered in our presentation to the Graduate School Committee.
Process: Are there specific data archiving notes for the outcome(s) you are reporting on in this report?	Data is maintained in digital copy by the Graduate Coordinator and backed up periodically on the network; original copies are saved in student academic files.
Plans	
Describe the unit's (or sub-units) assessment plans for the upcoming year.	We plan to continue the current assessment system unless suggestions for change are made during the 10-year review.

Table 6Fb. MS Graduate Learning Outcomes

Program:	MS, Sustainable Forest Management
College or Administrative Division:	College of Forestry
Subunit(s)	Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
Report Submitted By:	Dr. John Sessions, Graduate Program Chair and Madison Dudley, Graduate Program Coordinator
Email address:	Madison.dudley@oregonstate.edu
Date Submitted:	
Assessment Period:	
Due Date:	

	University: Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) for Master's students (approved by Faculty Senate on April 14, 2011)			**Program Level Student Learning Outcomes**								
Outcomes: University and program level student learning outcome (GLO)	Conduct research or produce some other form of creative work	Demonstrate mastery of subject material	Conduct scholarly or professional activities in an ethical manner	Program level GLO 1: Can State a Research Problem Clearly	Program level GLO 2: Knowledgeable About Literature	Program level GLO 3: Can Define Contribution of Proposed Research	Program level GLO 4: Can Apply State of the Art Tools	Program level GLO 5: Can Analyze and Interpret Results Effectively	Program level GLO 6: Can Communicate Clearly	Program level GLO 7: Can Think Critically	Program level GLO 8: Understand Broader Impact of Concluded Research	Program level GLO 9: Able to Develop a Journal of Conference Publication	Program level GLO 10: Received Ethics Training
Outcomes: What year was this program level learning outcome developed or most recently changed?	NA	NA	NA	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program , AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program , AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12

Assessment Method													
Assessment Method[1]: List the measures or instruments used to assess each outcome. [How do students demonstrate their attainment of the learning outcome? How is their learning evaluated?] At least one of these must be a direct measure. For additional guidance see: http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources	Final Examination	Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation
Assessment Method: Has this assessment method changed since the last reporting cycle? Yes or No. Explain any changes.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
[1]In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that assessment method remain consistent from year-to-year.													
Benchmark for evaluating satisfactory achievement of learning outcome													
Benchmark[2]***:*** What benchmark or milestone - related to the specific measure or instrument - is used to determine whether the outcome has been satisfactorily met by the students?	Thesis / Final Examination	GPA / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination	Rubric at Final Examination

Benchmark: Describe any changes to the benchmark or milestone since the last reporting cycle.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
[2] In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that benchmarks remain consistent from year-to-year.													
Process used for gathering assessment data													
Process: Describe the <u>data collection process</u> (e.g., Who is involved? How is the data collected?)	Thesis / Final Examination	GPA / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinat	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for	Rubrics at Final Examination – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad

				record-keeping			Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	or for record-keeping		Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping		record-keeping	Coordinator for record-keeping
What do the data show about student learning?													
Results: What do the data show about student learning relative to the specific learning outcome? Describe any result, pattern, or trends that you identify as meaningful or that highlights an area(s) of concern or success.	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Satisfactory **See the Report & Tables file for these**
Actions													
Actions: Describe any <u>course-level</u> (content, pedagogical, structural, etc.) changes that are an outgrowth of the current year's assessment of this outcome. Include timelines.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Actions: Describe any program or degree-level changes that are an outgrowth of the current year's assessment of this outcome. Include timeline.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Full-Cycle Impact													
Full-Cycle impact: If this learning outcome has been assessed previously and is being reported on again this year, what impact have the changes had (if any) on student learning? If you have not previously assessed this learning outcome, please indicate the year you will revisit this outcome.	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics

				is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.			program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.		program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	evidence for feedback.	provide direct evidence for feedback.	is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.

Process	
Process: Describe the process the program used to reflect on the outcome data.	Graduate Program Chair, SFM Graduate Committee, and Graduate Coordinator review results and present results to faculty at department meeting.
Process: Were there any challenges or concerns?	Since rubrics are managed within department and not the Graduate School, communication between department and major professors is essential for data collection to be ensured.
Process: How are the results of your assessment effort related to strategic planning and overall program review?	The SFM rubric system was developed in 2012 in consultation with the Graduate School, the graduate faculty committee, and reviewed with graduate faculty. The objective is to understand the skill level of students in the program in each particular dimension of their program. The Rubrics also form the basis for more uniform evaluation of students, a structure to provide feedback to students, and reduce uncertainty of student expectations for the examinations. Our assessment procedure is presented in the 5-year Self-study scheduled for May, 2017 and will be covered in our presentation to the Graduate School Committee.
Process: Are there specific data archiving notes for the outcome(s) you are reporting on in this report?	Data is maintained in digital copy by the Graduate Coordinator and backed up periodically on the network; original copies are saved in student academic files.

Plans	
Describe the unit's (or sub-units) assessment plans for the upcoming year.	We plan to continue the current assessment system unless suggestions for change are made during the 10-year review.

Table 6Fc. PhD Graduate Learning Outcomes

Program:	PhD, Sustainable Forest Management
College or Administrative Division:	College of Forestry
Subunit(s)	Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management
Report Submitted By:	Dr. John Sessions, Graduate Program Chair and Madison Dudley, Graduate Program Coordinator
Email address:	Madison.dudley@oregonstate.edu
Date Submitted:	
Assessment Period	
Due Date:	

	University: Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) for Doctoral students (approved by Faculty Senate on April 14, 2011)				Program Level Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes: University and program level student learning outcome (GLO)	Conduct research or produce some other form of creative work	Demonstrate mastery of subject material	Conduct scholarly or professional activities in an ethical manner	Effectively communicate in field of study	Program level GLO 1: Can State a Research Program Clearly	Program level GLO 2: Knowledgeable about Literature	Program level GLO 3: Can Define Contribution of Proposed Research	Program level GLO 4: Can Apply State of the Art Tools	Program level GLO 5: Can Analyze and Interpret Results Effectively	Program level GLO 6: Can Communicate Clearly	Program level GLO 7: Can Think Critically	Program level GLO 8: Understand Broader Impact of Concluded Research	Program level GLO 9: Able to Develop A Journal of Conference Publication	Program level GLO 10: Received Ethics Training
Outcomes: What year was this program level learning outcome developed or most recently changed?	NA	NA	NA	NA	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12	Start of program, AY 2011-12

Assessment Method														
Assessment Method[1]: <u>List the measures or instruments</u> used to assess each outcome. [How do students demonstrate their attainment of the learning outcome? How is their learning evaluated?] At least one of these must be a direct measure. For additional guidance see: http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources	Final Examination	Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Final Examination	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation	Direct – Individual Committee Member Evaluation
Assessment Method: Has this assessment method changed since the last reporting cycle? Yes or No. Explain any changes.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
[1]In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that assessment method remain consistent from year-to-year.														
Benchmark for evaluating satisfactory achievement of learning outcome														

Benchmark*[2]*: What benchmark or milestone - related to the specific measure or instrument - is used to determine whether the outcome has been satisfactorily met by the students?	Dissertation / Final Examination	GPA / Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Dissertation / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Rubric at Preliminary Examination / Final Examination
Benchmark*:* Describe any changes to the benchmark or milestone since the last reporting cycle.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
[2] In order to explore trends in the data, we advise that benchmarks remain consistent from year-to-year.														
Process used for gathering assessment data														
Process*:* Describe the data collection process (e.g., Who is involved? How is the data collected?)	Dissertation / Final Examination	GPA / Preliminary Examination / Final Examination	Completion of Coursework	Dissertation / Final Examination	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committ	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committ	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee members,	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following presentation,	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committ	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee members, collected following	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all committee members,	Rubrics at Preliminary & Final Examinations – provided by student's major professor to all

					members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	ee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	ee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	ee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping	committee members, collected following presentation, returned to Department Grad Coordinator for record-keeping
What do the data show about student learning?														
Results: What do the data show about student learning relative to the specific learning outcome? Describe any result, pattern, or trends that you identify as meaningful or that highlights an area(s) of concern or success.	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**	Strong **See the Report & Tables file for these**

Actions														
Actions: Describe any course-level (content, pedagogical, structural, etc.) changes that are an outgrowth of the current year's assessment of this outcome. Include timelines.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Actions: Describe any program or degree-level changes that are an outgrowth of the current year's assessment of this outcome. Include timeline.	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Full-Cycle Impact														
Full-Cycle impact: If this learning outcome has been assessed previously and is being reported on again this year, what impact have the changes had (if any) on student learning? If you have not previously assessed	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Being assessed at five-year review in May 2017	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of academic program at	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at beginning of	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared with students at	Positive – rubrics are in the Advising Guide and Website. They are shared

this learning outcome, please indicate the year you will revisit this outcome.					students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.	with students at beginning of academic program at the student orientation. Students understand program expectations. If student is unsuccessful at examination, the rubrics provide direct evidence for feedback.
Process														

Process: Describe the process the program used to reflect on the outcome data.	Graduate Program Chair, SFM Graduate Committee, and Graduate Coordinator review results and present results to faculty at department meeting.
Process: Were there any challenges or concerns?	Since rubrics are managed within department and not the Graduate School, communication between department and major professors is essential for data collection to be ensured.
Process: How are the results of your assessment effort related to strategic planning and overall program review?	The SFM rubric system was developed in 2012 in consultation with the Graduate School, the graduate faculty committee, and reviewed with graduate faculty. The objective is to understand the skill level of students in the program in each particular dimension of their program. The Rubrics also form the basis for more uniform evaluation of students, a structure to provide feedback to students, and reduce uncertainty of student expectations for the examinations. Our assessment procedure is presented in the 5-year Self-study scheduled for May, 2017 and will be covered in our presentation to the Graduate School Committee.
Process: Are there specific data archiving notes for the outcome(s) you are reporting on in this report?	Data is maintained in digital copy by the Graduate Coordinator and backed up periodically on the network; original copies are saved in student academic files.
Plans	
Describe the unit's (or sub-units) assessment plans for the upcoming year.	We plan to continue the current assessment system unless suggestions for change are made during the 10-year review.

Table G. Graduate Faculty Demographic Data and Permissions						GF Approvals (permissions)				
Name	**Position Type**	**Active**	**Gender**	**Citizenship**	**Race?**	**01**	**02**	**03**	**04**	**05**
Adams, Darius	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Adams, Paul	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Amishev, Dzhamal	Courtesy		m	i	unknown			x		
Anderson, Nathaniel	Affiliate		m	d	unknown			x		
Argerich, Alba	Courtesy		f	i	hispanic	x	x	x	x	x
Bailey, John	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Barrett, Tara	Courtesy		f	d	unknown			x		
Belart, Francisca	Professorial	x	f	i	unknown	x	x	x	x	x
Bladon, Kevin	Professorial	x	m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Blahna, Dale	Affiliate		m	d	unknown			x		
Chung, Woodam	Professorial	x	m	i	asian	x	x	x	x	x
Cushing, Tamara	Professorial	A*	f	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Davis, Anthony S.	Professorial	A*	m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Dombeck, Michael	Affiliate		m	d	unknown			x		
Dumroese, Kasten	Courtesy		m	d	white			x		
Dunn, Christopher	Research Assoc. Post-Doc		m	d	white		x	x		
Fitzgerald, Stephen	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	
Fried, Jeremy	Courtesy		m	d	white		x	x		
Garland, John	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Gonzalez Benecke, Carlos	Professorial	x	m	i	international	x	x	x	x	x
Gould, Peter	Affiliate		m	d	unknown	x		x		
Hailemariam, Temesgen	Professorial	x	m	i	black	x	x	x	x	x
Hansen, Eric	Professorial		m	d	white			x		x
Harrington, Constance	Courtesy		f	d	unknown			x		
Hatten, Jeffery	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Huntington, Geoff	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x		
Johnson, Daniel	Courtesy		m	d	unknown			x		
Johnson, James (Jim)	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Johnston, James	Research Assoc. Post-Doc		m	d	white			x		
Jolly, William	Courtesy		m	d	unknown			x		
Kellogg, Loren	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Kerns, Becky	Courtesy		f	d	unknown			x	x	x
Kincl, Laurel	Professorial		f	d	white			x		x
Kiser, Jim	Instructor	A*	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Knowles, Chris	Professorial		m	d	white			x		x
Kuusela, Olli-Pekka	Professorial	x	m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Latta, Greg	Courtesy		m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Leavell, Daniel	Professorial		m	d	asian white		x	x		
LeBoldus, Jared	Professorial	x	m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Leshchinsky, Ben	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Lesmeister, Damon	Courtesy		m	d	unknown			x		
Maguire, Douglas	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Maness, Thomas	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Mc Donnell, Jeffrey	Courtesy		m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Monleon, Vincente	Courtesy		m	d	unknown	x		x		
Montgomery, Claire	Professorial	A*	f	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Moriarty, Katie	Courtesy		f	d	white			x		
Morrell, Jeff	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Murphy, Glen	Emeritus		m	i	white	x	x	x	x	x
Nelson, Michael	Professorial		m	d	white	x		x		
Newton, Michael	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Olsen, Michael	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Pilkerton, Stephen	No rank		m	d	white		x	x	x	
Powers, Matthew	Professorial	A*	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Pyles, Marvin	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Ries, Paul	Courtesy		m	d	unknown	x	x	x	x	
Segura, Catalina	Professorial	x	f	i	hispanic	x	x	x	x	x
Sessions, Julian (John)	Professorial	A*	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Shaw, David	Professorial	A*	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Skaugset, Arne	Emeritus		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Sloat, Matthew	Courtesy		m	d	white			x		
Sobota, Daniel	Courtesy		m	d	unknown			x		
Souder, Jon	Professorial	A*	m	d	unknown	x	x	x	x	x
Strimbu, Bogdan	Professorial	x	m	i	international	x	x	x	x	x
Strunk, Jacob	Courtesy		m	d	white			x		
Tesch, Steven	Professorial		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Thompson, Matthew	Courtesy		m	d	white			x		
Van Den Hoek, Jamon	Professorial		m	d	white			x	x	
Ver Hoef, Jay	Affiliate		m	d	white			x		
Wagenbrenner, Joseph	Courtesy		m	d	unknw			x		
White, Eric	Courtesy		m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Williams, Wyatt	Affiliate		m	d	unknown			x		
Wing, Michael	Professorial	x	m	d	white	x	x	x	x	x
Zald, Harold	Courtesy		m	d	white			x		
Zamora Cristales, Rene	Post-Doc Scholar		m	i	international			x		
					TOTAL	45	46	75	44	43

A*. Retired, Full-time Administrator, Extension, or Instructor

Table H. "ScholarsArchive" data on theses and dissertations (T/D)[1]

[1] *Program unable to collect ScholarsArchive data as requested, please see summary of completed theses/dissertations*

Student Author	Major Professor	Major	Degree Type	Year Presented	Title
Barnett, Jennifer Suzanne	Murphy	FE	MS	2012 - May	Estimating Volume and Value on Standing Timber in Hybrid Poplar Plantations Using Terrestrial Laser Scanning
Dinger, Eric John	Rose	FR	PhD	2012 - May	Characterizing early-seral competitive mechanisms influencing Douglas-fir seedling growth, vegetation community development, and physiology of selected weedy plant species
Rancier, Racquel	Huntington	WRPM	MS	2012 - May	Assessing Tribal Water Rights Settlements as a Means for Resolving Disputes Over Instream Flow Claims: A Comparative Case Approach
Wing, Brian Matthew	Boston	FE	PhD	2012 - June	Connecting the Dots: Using Filtered Airborne Discrete-Return Lidar to Identify and Predict Unique Forest Attributes
Kim, Dong-Wook	Murphy	FE	MS	2012 - June	Modeling Air Drying of Douglas-fir and Hybrid Poplar Biomass in Oregon
Fekety, Patrick A	Bailey	FR	MF	2012 - June	N/A - Project Title: A History of Southwestern Oregon's Forests: People, Ecology, and Socio-Politics that Shaped the Landscape
Long, Justin	Boston	FE	MF	2012 (June?)	N/A
Strunk, Jacob L	Temesgen	FR	PhD	2012 - June	Estimation and Modeling of Selected Forest Attributes with Lidar and Landsat
Gagliasso, Donald	Temesgen	SFM	MS	2012 - Oct	Evaluating the Accuracy of Imputed Forest Biomass Estimates at the Project Level
Lee, Yo Han	Albers / Montgomery	FR	PhD	2012 - Dec	Initial Attack Fire Suppression, Spatial Resource, Allocation, and Fire Prevention Policy in California, the United States, and the Republic of Korea
Munoz, Bethany	Bailey	FR	MS	2012 - Dec	Influence of Silvicultural Treatments, Overstory, and Understory Vegetation on Quaking Aspen (Populus tremuloides) Rengeneration in Southeastern Idaho
Becerra, Fernando	Murphy	FE	MS	2012 - Dec	Evaluation of Six Tools for Estimating Woody Biomass Moisture Content
Pickard, Brian	Maness	FR	MS	2013 - Mar	Keying Forest Stream Protection to Aquatic Ecosystem Values in Multi-ownership Watersheds
Zamora Cristales, Rene	Sessions	FE	PhD	2013 - May	Economic Optimization of Forest Biomass Processing and Transport
Egan, Fey	Skaugset	FE	MF	2013 - Jun	N/A – Project Title: Modeling and testing parameters for seepage through an earthen levee using ABAQUS CAE.
Rogers, Nicole	Maguire	SFM	MS	2013 - July	Estimation of Leaf Area Index and Simulation of Evapotranspiration for Intensively Managed Douglas-fir Forests
Agne, Michelle	Shaw	SFM	MS	2013 - Sep	The Influence of Dwarf Mistletoe on Stand Structure, Canopy Fuels, and Fire Behavior in Lodgepole Pine Forests 21-28 Years Post-Mountain Pine Beetle Epidmeic in Central Oregon
De Witt, Austin	Boston	FE	MF	2013 - Sep	N/A – Project Title: Predicting Aggregate Degradation in Forest Roads in Northwest Oregon
Owens, Hazel	Skauset	WRS	MS	2013 - Sep	Relationships Between Stream Discharge and Cutthroat Trout Abundance at Multiple Scales in Managed Headwater Basins of Western Oregon
Pangle, Luke	McDonnell	WRS	PhD	2013 - Sep	Ecohydrological Mediation of Water Budget Partitioning and Time Scales of Subsurface Flow in a Seasonally Semi-arid Grassland
Hunt, (Matthew) Chili	Bailey & Jensen	FR	MF	2013 - Sep	N/A
Flint, Benjamin	Kellogg	FE	MS	2013 - Oct	Analysis and Operational Considerations of Biomass Extraction on Steep Terrain in Western Oregon
Comfort, Emily	Bailey & Betts	FR	PhD	2013 - Dec	Management for Fire Risk Reduction and Northern Spotted Owl Habitat Protection in Dry Conifer Forestest of Southern Oregon
Harrison, Jane	Montgomery	FR	PhD	2013 - Dec	The Impact of Social capital on Well-being in Rural Communities
Lefebvre, Robbie	Rose	FR	MS	2013 - Dec	The Combined Effects of Vegetation Control and Seeding Size Class on Barefoot Douglas-fir Seediling Productivity on a Site in Oregon

Arechiga, (Theresa) Ramona	Bailey	FR	MS	2014 - Jan	Forest Structure and Composition Changes in a Tropical Montane Cloud Forest Surrounding an Illegal Village in Bale Mountains National Park: Anthropogenic Disturbance along Forest Resource Trails and Implications for Conservation
Beck, Storm	Sessions	SFM/CE	MS	2014 - Mar	Use of LiDAR to identify forest transportation networks
DeMarco, Ariadne	Shaw	SFM	MS	2014 - Apr	Pine Butterfly (*Neophasia menapia*) Outbreak in the Malheur National Forest, Blue Mountains, Oregon: Examining Patterns of Defoliation
Gilbreath, Chad	Sessions	SFM	MF	2014 - Apr	N/A - Project Title: Fuel Consumption Factors for Log Truck Transportation in South East Alaska
Christian, Jared	Sessions	SFM	MF	2014 - Jun	N/A - Project Title: Oregon Departmenty of Forestry Logging Cost Update
Peterman, Wendy	Adams, P. & Waring	FE	PhD	2014 - Jun	Using soil data to enhance modeling of forest responses to climate change
Miller, Rebecca H	Skaugset	WRE	MS	2014 - Jun	Influence of Log Truck Traffic and Road Hydrology on Sediment Yield in Western Oregon
Vogler, Kevin	Bailey	FR	MS	2014 - Jun	Sustainable Biomass Supply from Fuel Reduction Treatments: A Biomass Assessment of Federally Owned Land in Eastern Oregon
Pavez, Ricardo	Sessions	SFM	MS	2014 - Jul	An Optimization Model to Allocate Forestry Incentives Funds in Teak Plantations of the Southern-Coastal Region of Guatemala
Platt, Emily	Bailey	FR	PhD	2014 - Aug	Integrated Social-Ecological Research on Forests and Wildfire in Central Oregon
Crandall, Mindy	Montgomery	AREc, FE Minor	PhD	2014 - Sep	Employment, Social Capital, and Spatial Determinants of Poverty Change
Jeroue, Lacey	Hailemariam	SFM	MS	2014 - Sep	Predicting urban tree attributes for major species found in urbanized areas of the western Pacific states
Shettles, Michael	Hailemariam	SFM	MS	2014 - Sep	Error Propagation in Estimating Aboveground Biomass Using Terrestrial LiDAR
Romero, Pablo	Maguire	SFM	MS	2014 - Oct	Thinning Effects on Stand and Tree Growth; Different Perspectives on Same Old Questions
Fjeran, Taylor	Bailey	SFM	MS	2014 - Dec	Treatment Options for Controlling *Brachypodium sylvaticum* and Impacts on Native Vegetation
Alexanderson, Dorian	Shaw	SFM	MF	2014 - Dec	N/A - Project Title: Case Study of Commericial Thinning: Hood Canal Tree Farm
Schenk (Grisa), Amanda	Boston	SFM	MS	2014 - Dec	Judicial Deference and Its Potential Effect on Agency Science and Natural Resource Management
Coons, Kristin	Maguire	SFM	MS	2014 - Dec	Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) Biomass and Nutrient Removal under Varying Harvest Scenarios Involving Co-production of Timber and Feedstock for Liquid Biofuels
Taylor, Max	Hatten	SFM	MF	2014 - Dec	N/A - Project Title: On Quantifying Complexity: An exploration of pressing challenges in soil science from geographical and statistical perspectives
Hall, Michael	White	SFM	MS	2015 - Feb	Remote Detection and Predicted Locations of NIPF Fuel Treatments in Central Oregon
Ensley, Jona	Bailey	SFM	MS	2015 - Mar	Comparing Himalayan Blackberry (Rubus armeniacus) Management Techniques in Upland Prairie Communities of the W.L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge
Loeppky, Janna	Sessions	SFM	MF	2015 - Mar	N/A - Project title: Energy Consumption of Grinding Unbaled and Baled Forest Harvest Residues
Poudel, Krishna	Temesgen	FR	PhD	2015 - May	Strategies for Sampling and Estimation of Aboveground Tree Biomass
Kemp, Erica	Leshchinsky	WRE	MS	2015 - Jun	Sediment Transport Prototypes: Novel Methods to Disconnect Forest Roads from Streams
Barnhart, Amy	Bailey	SFM	MF	2015 - Jun	N/A - Project title: Post-Fire Erosion on Experimental Silvicultural Treatments in Southwest Oregon, U.S.A.
Burke, Adam	Fitzgerald	SFM	MS	2015 - Jun	Distribution of Live Biomass, Herbivory and Foliar Retention in Central Oregon Lodgepole Pine (Pinus contorta ssp. murrayana) crowns
Dunn, Christopher	Bailey	FR	PhD	2015 - Jun	Mixed Severity Fire: Biological Legacies and Vegetation Response in *Pseudotsuga* Forests of Oregon's Cascade Range
Marcille, Kate	Montgomery	SFM	MF	2015 - Jun	N/A - Project Title: Suppression Resource Allocation and Productivity on Large Wildland Fires
Berry, Michael	Sessions	SFM	MF	2015 - Jun	N/A - Project Title: Assessing Spatial Distribution and Availability of Forest Biomass by Harvesting System in the Pacific Northwest, USA
Delgado-Trejo, Jorge	Boston	SFM	MS	2015 - Jun	Using Acoustic Measurements and Inventory Data to Estimate Stiffness in Standing Douglas-Fir Trees.

Osborne, Nathaniel	Maguire	SFM	PhD	2015 - Aug	Development of a forest growth, yield and wood properties software for intensively managed Douglas-fir plantations in the Pacific Northwestern U.S.A.
McAdam, Erick	Hilker	SFM	MS	2015 - Dec	Using Remote Sesnsing and Process-based Growth Modeling to Predict Forest Productivity across Western Oregon
Frentress, Jay	McDonnell	WRS	PhD	2015 - Dec	The Role of Near-stream Zones on Flow, Chemistry, and Isoptopic Composition at the Headwater Scale
Gagnon, Aaron	Montgomery	SFM	MS	2015 - Dec	Economic Benefit From Allowing Wildfires To Burn in U.S.F.S. East-Side Cascade Forests
Hanna, Scott	Boston	FE	MF	2015 - Dec	Determining the material properties of aggregate from eleven quarries commonly used by the forest industry and comparing the forest road manager's prediction of the aggregate's performance
Craigg, Terry	P. Adams	FE	PhD	2016 - May	Applications of Soil Science in Forest Landscape Planning: Challenges and Opportunities in the 21st Century
Ayotte, Seth	Fitzgerald	SFM	MF	2016 - May	Simulation of slvicultural alternatives for ponderosa pine forest restoration
McCorkle, Jason	Cushing	SFM	MF	2016 - May	Wildfire Management in the WUI: Transition to Fire-Adapted Communities
Kim, Yaejun	Chung	SFM	MS	2016 - May	The effect of Downed-trees on Harvesting Productivity and Costs in Beetle-killed Stands
Bair, Russell	Segura	WRE	MS	2016 - Jun	Stick'n'Cricks: Modeling Large Wood Impacts on Stream Hydrodynamics and Juvenile Salmon Habitat Subtitle of event or speaker
Katz, Scott	Segura	WRE	MS	2016 - Jun	Sediment Transport Modeling and Implications for Benthic Primary Producers in Oak Creek, OR
Wilhelmi, Nicholas	Shaw	SFM	MS	2016 - Jun	The Effects of Seed Source and Planting Environment on Douglas-fir Foliage Diseases
Rodman, Henry	Maguire / Hailemariam	SFM	MS	2016 - Jun	Forest soils and topography: decoding the influence of physical site characteristics on soil water and forest productivity in Oregon's Coast Ranges
Belart, Francisca	Sessions (Murphy?)	SFM	PhD	2016 - Jul	Forest harvest residue moisture management in the Pacific Northwest
Huff, Steven	Hailemariam	SFM	MS	2016 - Jul	Quantifying aboveground biomass for common shrubs in northeastern California
Gourley, Derek	Maguire	SFM	MS	2016 - Jul	Impact of climate, disturbance, and nutrient amendments on the formation of earlywood and latewood controls in Douglas Fir
Priebe, James (Jim)	Powers	SFM	MS	2016 - Sept	Silvicultural Treatment Impacts on Understory Trees and Long-Term Understory Vegetation Dynamics in Mature Douglas-Fir Forests
Hoe, Michael	Hailemariam	SFM	MS	2016 - Sept	Using multi-temporal LiDAR to quantify fire effects over a mixed ownership landscape in southwestern Oregon
Gallo, Adrian	Hatten	SFM	MS	2016 - Sept	Responses in soil following intensive biomass and compaction treatments in the Oregon Cascades
Taylor, Andrew	Powers	SFM	MF	2016 - Dec	Understory Vegetation Dynamics and Midstory Development Following Understory Release Treatments in the Northwest Oregon Thinned Douglas-fir Stands
Morici, Kat	Bailey	SFM	MS	2017 - Feb	Fuel Treatment Longevity in the Blue Mountains
Daugherty, Bryent	Sessions	SFM	MF	2017 - Mar	Improving Large Trailer Access for Biomass Recovery
Murillo Sandoval, Paulo	Van Den Hoek (GEOG)	SFM	MS	2017 - Mar	Making Better Maps of Montane Forest Disturbance: "Leveraging Multi-Sensor Time Series Datasets to Map Short- and Long-Term Forest Disturbances and Drivers of Change in the Colombian Andes"
Trick, Brian	Cushing	SFM	MF	2017 - Mar	Exercises in Due Process and the Takings Clause: How State Action May Trigger Regulatory Takings Claims
Alveshere, Brandon	LeBoldus	SFM	MS	2017 - Jun	Riparian Forest Health on the northern Great Plains
Lauer, Chris	Montgomery	AREc	PhD	2017 - Jun	Determining Optimal Timber Harvest and Fuel Treatment on a Fire-threatened Landscape Using Approximate Dynamic Programming
Berry, Michael	Sessions	SFM	PhD	2017 - Jul	Evaluating Transportable Conversion Facilities for a Forest Biomass Supply Chain in the Pacific Northwest, USA
Matosziuk, Lauren	Hatten	SFM	MS	2017 - Aug	Effects of Season and Interval of Prescribed Burns on Pyrogenic Carbon Cycling in Ponderosa Pine Stands in Malheur National Forest
Credo, Kevin	Bailey	SFM	MS	2017 - Aug	Assessing alternatives for fuel reduction treatment and Pacific marten conservation in the Lassen region, California, USA
Burnett, Jonathan	Wing	SFM	PhD	2017 - Sep	Environmental Remote Sensing with Unmanned Aircraft Systems

Table J. Student retention, degree completion and attrition - SFM ONLY

ACADEMIC YEAR		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total (as applicable)	Trend[€]
Total number of degrees awarded (no.)		**0**	**1**	**6**	**17**	**8**	**12**	**44**	**0.76**
Gender (no.)	Male	0	1	3	9	8	10	**31**	
	Female	0	0	3	8	0	2	**13**	
Citizenship[1] (no.)	Domestic	0	1	6	14	6	10	**37**	
	International	0	0	0	3	2	2	**7**	
Oregon Residency (no.)	Resident	0	0	4	3	1	3	**11**	
	Non-Resident	0	1	2	14	7	9	**33**	
Primary Campus of Student (no.)	Corvallis	0	1	6	17	8	12	**44**	
	Ecampus	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Cascades	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
Race/Ethnicity (no.)	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	
	White	0	1	6	13	6	9	**35**	
	Black	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	Persons reporting two or more races	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
	International	0	0	0	3	2	2	**7**	
Degree (no.)*	Master's	0	1	6	17	7	11	**42**	
	Doctoral	0	0	0	0	1	1	**2**	
Median time to degree completion (years)									
Degree	Master's[2]	N/A	13 terms	7 terms	7 terms	5 terms	6.55 terms		
	Doctoral	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9 terms	14 terms		
First-year retention & graduation rates (% of total no.) ***(using Fall term enrollment; if admitted after Fall, student is included in next year's counts)***									
Degree	Master's								
	Cohort year	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	
	Cohort N	0	1	15	11	12	13	16	
	Retention rate	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	
	Doctoral								
	Cohort year	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	
	Cohort N	0	0	3	5	3	5	4	
	Retention rate	0%	0%	100%	80%	100%	100%	75%	
Second-year retention & graduation rates (% of total no.)									
Degree	Master's								
	Cohort year	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	
	Cohort N	0	0	0	1	15	11	12	
	Retention rate	0%	0%	0%	100%	80%	100%	100%	
	Doctoral								
	Cohort year	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	
	Cohort N	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	
	Retention rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	80%	100%	
Graduation rate (% of total no.) averages									
Degree	Master's (4-year rate, cohort-based)								
	Cohort year	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**					
	Cohort N	1	15	11					
	Graduation rate	100%	73%	TBD					
	Doctoral (8-year rate, cohort-based)								
	Cohort year	**2021**							
	Cohort N	4							
	Graduation rate	50%							
ACAEMIC YEAR		**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	
Degrees awarded in other graduate programs by graduate faculty in this program (i.e. – serving as primary advisor for a student who graduated in a major outside of this program) **(no.)**									
Degree	Master's	ND	**14**	?	?	?	?	?	
	Doctoral	ND	**3**	?	?	?	?	?	

Notes:

[€] Trend Data: correlation coefficient formula used

* Add lines if more than one master's or doctoral degree is offered, and report data separately for each degree offered.

1. Citizenship is based on Non-Resident Alien Status (international)

2. Masters degree completion counts include M.F. and M.S. degrees

Median Time to Degree Completion Definition

Time to degree is computed by counting the elapsed years from entry term to graduation term. For masters degrees, the entry term is the first term that the student be degree seeking graduate student (regardless of the degree sought, masters or doctorate). For doctoral degrees, the entry term is the first term enrolled as a degree seeking doctoral student, even if they started earlier as a masters student. The elapsed time is computed such that a student starting in fall term and graduating in spring would be considered to have graduated within 1 year. For a given program and degree level, we compute the median time to degree, i.e., the value at which 50% of cases are below and 50% are above.

Retention/Graduation Rates Definitions

Retention and graduation rates are determined using designated fall and summer cohorts. The graduate cohort is comprised of degree seeking graduate students whose first enrolled term at the designated graduate level is a fall term. For example a student at the master's level would be included in the 2010 master's cohort if their first term of enrollment as a master's student was in fall 2010. Students with prior graduate degrees are excluded from the cohort for that degree level.

The First Year Graduate Retention Rate is the percentage of an entering fall term cohort that enrolled in the subsequent fall term and/or earned a degree before that term. For example, the first year retention rate of the fall 2009 cohort is the percent of that cohort that enrolled in fall 2010 plus the number that earned a degree at the designated level before fall of 2010. We report the rate under the academic year in which the students were retained, so that the fall 2009 cohort retention rate is reported in the 2010-11 academic year.

The Second Year Graduate Retention Rate is the percentage of an entering fall term cohort that enrolled in the fall term and/or earned a degree before that term. For example, the second year retention rate of the fall 2009 cohort is the percent of that cohort that enrolled in fall 2011 plus the number that earned a degree at the designated level before fall of 2011. We report the rate under the academic year in which the students were retained, so that the fall 2009 cohort retention rate is reported in the 2011-12 academic year.

The Masters 4 Year Graduation Rate is the percentage of an entering fall term master's cohort that received a master's degree within four years of their first term as a degree-seeking master's student at OSU. For example, the four-year graduation rate of the fall 2004 cohort is the percentage that received at least one master's degree from OSU from fall 2004 to summer 2008. We report the four-year graduation rate under the academic year that concludes the four year period. For example, the four-year graduation rate of the fall 2004 cohort is reported under the 2008-09 academic year heading.

The Doctoral 8 Year Graduation Rate is the percentage of an entering fall term doctoral cohort that received a doctoral degree within eight years of their first term as a degree-seeking doctoral student at OSU. For example, the eight-year graduation rate of the fall 2003 cohort is the percentage that received at least one doctoral degree from OSU from fall 2003 to summer 2011. We report the eight-year graduation rate under the academic year that concludes the eight year period. For example, the eight-year graduation rate of the fall 2003 cohort is reported under the 2011-12 academic year heading.

Table K – Post-graduation placement and employment

FERM Graduates 2003 – 2017: includes known employment for our Forest Engineering (FE), Forest Resources (FR), Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), Forest Science (FS), Applied Economics (AREc) and Water Resources majors (if known)

Name	Major	Degree Earned	Position	Company / Agency of Employment
Marbet, Christine	FE	MS	Remote Sensing/GIS Spec	Spatial Solutions, Inc., Brownsville, OR
Keim, Richard	FE	PhD	Professor	LSU
Matzka, Peter	FE	PhD	Extension Forester	OSU Extension
Goard, Deborah	FE	MS	Extension Forester	New Hampshire
Hartter, Joel	FE	MS	Assoc. Professor	Univ. of Colorado
Tromp-Van Meerveld, Hilda	FE	PhD	Research Professor	ETH Zurich
Bielecki, Christopher	FE	MF	Logging Engineer	U.S. Forest Service
Clark, Melissa	FE	MF		NCRS, Snow Program, Portland, OR
Dodson, Elizabeth	FE	PhD	Assoc. Prof	Univ. of Montana
Luecker Burleson, Terry	FE	MS	Project Planner	Umpqua Rivers Watershed Council
Mc Guire, Kevin	FE	PhD	Assoc. Prof	Virginia Tech
Marshall, Hamish	FE	PhD	Director	Margules Groome
Wirth, Julie	FR	MS	Wetland Scientist	OBEC Consulting Engineers
Michel, Alexa	FS	MS	Scientist	Thunen, Institute of Forest Ecosystems
Daniel, Isaac	FR	MS	Instructor	Oregon State University
Meehan, Nathan	FE	MS	Research Forester	Weyerhaeuser
Royer, Timothy	FE	MS	Private Consultant	Logan, UT
Acuna, Mauricio	FE	PhD		Univ. of Sunshine Coast Australia
Bolding, M. Chad	FS, FE	PhD	Assoc. Prof	Virginia Tech
Yost, Andrew	FS	PhD	Forest Ecologist	ODF
Eckert, Bradley	FR	MF	Silviculturist	USDA Forest Service Cody, WY
Bohle, Karina	FE	MF	Private Consultant	Rotorua, New Zealand
Evans, Daniel	FE	MS	Research Associate	Plymouth State University
Alley, David	FE	MF	Private Consultant	Oregon
Weiskittel, Aaron	FR,FS	PhD	Assoc. Professor	University of Maine
Helvoigt, Ted	FR	PhD	CEO	Evergreen Economics
Konoshima, Masashi	FR	PhD	Asst. Prof	Univ. of the Ryukyus Okinawa, Japan
Mazurkiewicz, Adam	FE	MS	Research Hydrologist	City of San Francisco, CA

Table K – Post-graduation placement and employment

Bord, Andrea	FE	MS	Private Consultant	California
Shanks, Alyssa	FR	MS	Analyst	Alaska Dept. of Employment
Nabel, Mark	FS	MS	Silviculturist	Forest Service R3
Taylor, Michael	FS	MS	Nursery Manager	IFA Nurseries, Inc.
Otis, Timothy	FE	MS	Principal Engineer	Cascade Earth Scientists, Albany, OR
Younger, Nicole	FR	MS	Consultant	Shade, OR
Van Verseveld, Willem	FE	PhD	Research Hydrologist	Delares, The Netherlands
Toman, Elizabeth	FE	PhD	Visiting Asst Prof	Ohio State University
Spong, Ben	FE	PhD	Assoc. Prof	West Virginia
Mc Farlane, Karis	FE	PhD	Research Scientist	Lawrence Livermore National Lab
Kibler, Kelly	FE	MS	Asst Prof	Univ of Central Florida
Hale, V. Cody	FE	MS	Forest Hydrologist	Nutter & Associates, Georgia
Eklund, Aaron	FE	MF	Forest Engineer	BLM, Eugene, OR
Amishev, Dzhamal	FE	PhD	Researcher	FPInnovations Vancouver, Canada
Busby, Gwenlyn	FR	PhD	Economist	Greenwood Resources, Portland, OR
Calderon Sanchez, Dorian Augusto	FE	MF	Planning Logging Engineer	Smurfit, Cali, Colombia
Hamann, Jeffery	FE	PhD	Private Consultant	Oregon
Slesak, Robert	FE	PhD	Site-Level Program Manager	Minnesota Forest Resources Council
Huff, Tristan	FR	MS	Asst. Prof	OSU Extension
Surfleet, Christopher	FE	PhD	Assoc. Prof	Cal Poly
Downs, Theodore	FS	MS	Plant Manager	Roseburg Forest Products
Norlander, Daniel	FS	MS	Forest Health Specialist	ODF
Lindsay, Amanda	FS	MS	Silviculturist/Forester	USFS
Drake, Timothy	FR	MS	Forest Inventory & Analysis	Lone Rock Timber
Ayele, Zeleke	FR	PhD	VP, Inst Dev & Int Relations	Addis Ababa Sci & Tech Univ, Ethiopia
Eskelson, Bianca	FR	PhD	Asst. Prof	UBC
Thompson, Matthew	FR, FE	PhD	Researcher	Rocky Mountain Station
Barnard, Holly	FS	PhD	Asst Prof	Univ of Colorado, Boulder
Zegre, Nicolas	FR	PhD	Assoc Prof	West Virginia
Orrego, Sergio	FR	PhD	Professor	Univ of Colombia, Medellin
Pattison, Justin	FE	MF	Civil Engineer	National Park Service
Meadows, Matthew	FE	MS	FRA	Univ of CA Merced, CA

Table K – Post-graduation placement and employment

Pilkerton, Stephen	FE	PhD	Forest Engineer	OSU Research Forests
Craigg, Terry	FR, FE	PhD	Soil Scientist	Deschutes, NF
Kiser, James	FS	PhD	Instructor	Oregon State University
Clark, Joshua	FE	PhD	Harvest Sched Analyst	ODF
Goerndt, Michael	FR	PhD	Asst. Prof	Missouri State University
Goracke, Heidi	FR	MS	Co-Owner	Goracke Timber Management, LLC
Marquardt, Theresa	FR	MS	Forest Inventory Lead	Green Diamond
Lam, Tzeng Yih	FS	PhD	Asst Prof	National Taiwan University
Raggon, Mark	FS	MS	Fish Biologist	USDA, Pacific Northwest Region
Simwanda, Matamyo	FE	MS	Assoc. Dean	Copperbelt University, Zambia
Dowding, Bodie	FE	MS	Forester	Interfor Pacific
Dunn, Christopher	FR	PhD	Research Associate, Post Doc	Oregon State University
Haxton, Zane	FR	MS	Analyst	Scientific Certification Sys, Berkeley, CA
Hakso, Andrew	FE	MF	Appraiser	Albany, OR
Han, Sang-Kyun	FE	PhD	Professor	Korea
Inman, Aaron	FE	MF	Forest Engineer	Oregon Dept. of Forestry
Shuffield, Chaylon	FR	MS	Fire Ecologist	Fremont-Winema NF
Edson, Curtis	FR	PhD	Asst. Prof, Lt. Colonel	US Military Academy
Houtman, Rachel	FR	MS	Faculty Research Assistant	Oregon State University
Vanderberg, Michael	FE	PhD	Private Consulting	Flagstaff, AZ
Craven, Michael	FE	MS	Forest Engineer	Weyerhaeuser
Kokenge, Kyler	FE	MS	Civil Engineer	Washington DNR
Schmidt, Christian	FE	MS	Forest Operations	Kodiak, AK
Stander, Hendrik	FE	PhD	Business Analyst	MBG, Portland, OR
Mortenson, Leif	FS	MS	Forestry Technician	PNW Research Station, USFS
Frank, Jereme	FE	MS	Biomass Sampling Res. Assist	University of Maine
Meininger, William	FE	MS	Private Consulting	Denver, CO
Barnett, Jennifer	FE	MS	Analyst, Watershed Services	Corvallis, OR
Fekety, Patrick	FR	MF	Researcher	Univ. of Minnesota
Kim, Dongwook	FE	MS	PhD Student	Univ. of Montana
Long, Justin	FE	MF	Forester	Washington DNR
Dinger, Eric	FS, FR	PhD	Aquatic Ecologist	KLMN National Park Service
Strunk, Jacob	FR	PhD	Geospatial Analyst	Washington DNR

Table K – Post-graduation placement and employment

Wing, Brian	FE	PhD	Post-Doctoral Research	PSW, USDA Forest Service
Gagliasso, Donald	SFM	MS	Geospatial Analyst	Mason Girard & Bruce
Becerra, Fernando	FR	MS	Transportation Planner	US Forest Service, Petersburg, AK
Egan, Fey	FE	MF	Hydrologic Technician	US Forest Service, Springfield, OR
Zamora Cristales, Rene	FE	PhD	Research Coordinator	World Resources Institute
Pickard, Brian	FR	MS	PhD Student	North Carolina State University
Munoz, Bethany	FR	MS	PhD Student	Univ. of Maine
Agne, Michelle	SFM	MS	Faculty Research Assistant	Oregon State University
De Witt, Austin	FE	MF	Private Consultant; Lecturer	California; Humboldt State University
Flint, Ben	FE	MS	Forest Engineer	Washington DNR
Harrison, Jane	FR	PhD	Social Science Specialist	Univ. of Wisconsin – Sea Grant Institute
Rogers, Nicole	SFM	MS	Database Manager/Analyst	Univ. of Maine
Arechiga, T. Ramona	FR	MS	Lands Coordinator	Bay Area Parks and Rec
Comfort, Emily	FR	PhD	Visiting Scholar	Ireland
Lefebvre, Robbie	FR	MS	Reforestation Forester	Oregon Dept. of Forestry – Astoria, OR
Beck, Storm	SFM/CE	MS	Road Manager	Hancock, Colville, OR
Christian, Jared	SFM	MF	Forest Operations	Weyco
Gilbreath, Chad	SFM	MF	Associate Appraiser	Northwest Farm Credit Services
Peterman, Wendy	FE	PhD	Scientist	Conservation Biology Institute
Pavez, Ricardo	SFM	MS	Consultant	Guatemala City
Platt, Emily	FR	PhD	Region 6 Planner	Forest Service
Shettles, Michael	SFM	MS	Forest Inventory Analyst	USDA Forest Service
Vogler, Kevin	FR	MS	Faculty Research Asst.	Oregon State University
Jeroue, Lacey	SFM	MS	Consultant	Hood River, OR
Romero Castano, Pablo	SFM	MS	Forester	Washington DNR
Owens, Hazel	WRS	MS	Hydrologist	Winema NF
Miller, Rebecca	WRS	MS	Engineer	Geoengineers, Boise, ID
Lee, Yo Han	AEC /FR	PhD	Asst Prof	Yeungnam University, South Korea
Crandall, Mindy	AEC	PhD	Asst. Prof	Univ. of Maine
DeMarco, Ariadne	SFM	MS	Entom. Consultant	San Francisco, CA
Alexanderson, Dorian	SFM	MF	Manufacturing Intern	Stimson – Forest Grove, OR
Fjeran, Taylor	SFM	MS	Graduate Program	Teaching Program in Western WA
(Schenk) Grisa, Amanda	SFM	MS	Hydrographer	Oregon Water Resources Dept

Table K – Post-graduation placement and employment

Coons, Kristin	SFM	MS	Presale Forester	USDA Forest Service – Gold Beach, OR
Hall, Michael	SFM	MS	Resource Analyst / Southern Ohio Stewardship Coord.	Nature Conservancy, Ohio
Loeppky, Janna	SFM	MF	Asst. Water Master	Oregon Water Resources Dept
Taylor, Maxwell	SFM	MF	Geospatial Analyst	Great Basin Landscape Conservancy NV
Ensley, Jona	SFM	MS	Fire Ecologist	USDA Forest Service – Lakeview, OR
Berry, Michael	SFM	PhD	PhD Student	Oregon State University
Burke, Adam	SFM	MS	Sports Director	Univ. of Wyoming
Barnhart, Amy	SFM	MF	Research Tech	USDA Forest Service – Pringle Falls, OR
Delgado Trejo, Jorge Luis	SFM	MS	Technician	Amer Forest Mgm, Inc – Charlotte, NC
Poudel, Krishna	FR	PhD	Postdoctoral Scholar	Oregon State University
Marcille, Kate	SFM	MF	Research Associate	University of Montana
Osborne, Nathaniel	SFM	PhD	Biometrician	Weyerhaeuser, Centralia, WA
Gagnon, Aaron	SFM	MS	Planner	USFS
Hanna, Scott	FE	MF	District Engineer	Washington DNR
Craigg, Terry	FE	PhD	Soil Scientist	USFS – Deschutes NF
Ayotte, Seth	SFM	MF	Ecologist	USDA – Resource Mon & Assessment
McCorkle, Jason	SFM	MF	Forest Technician	A&H Forestry
Wilhelmi, Nicholas	SFM	MS		Washington DNR
Rodman, Henry	SFM	MS	Forest Biometrician	SilviaTerra
Katz, Scott	WRE	MS	Geomorphologist	Natural Systems Design, WA
Belart, Francisca	FE, SFM	PhD	Asst. Prof / Ext Specialist	Oregon State University
Hoe, Michael	SFM	MS	Verification Forester	SCS Global Services
Gallo, Adrian	SFM	MS	Graduate Student (PhD)	Oregon State University
Murillo Sandoval, Paulo	SFM	MS	Graduate Student (PhD)	Oregon State University
Daugherty, Bryent	SFM	MF	Forester	Washington DNR
Morici, Katherine	SFM	MS	Research Associate	Colorado Forest Restoration Institute
Alveshere, Brandon	SFM	MS	Graduate Student (PhD)	University of Connecticut
Matosziuk, Lauren	SFM	MS	Research Assistant, Post Doc	Oregon State University
Daniels, Dixie	SFM	MS	Graduate Student (PhD)	Oregon State University
Lauer, Chris	AEC	PhD	Postdoctoral Scholar	Colorado State Univ

Last updated 10/9/17