Chair Catherine Mater called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Self-introduction of participants followed. Hal Salwasser reviewed the agenda with the participants. The purpose of the meeting was for the committee to advise the College on how to move forward with rebranding.

Hal Salwasser began his presentation by setting the context with the 9 billion people challenge – *Will the College educate students differently than done in the past, and how will the College create knowledge and technologies to enable increased production and conservation efficiency to society and industries?* Hal gave an update on the outcome of the legislative session, the current budget situation, and the federal funding reduction (McIntire-Stennis funding). He described the future challenges and presented information about the history of the College/FRL funding. Hal distributed a 4-page PPT handout containing the information he presented: funding information, charts and graphs on the College productivity, efficiency, staffing, CoF/FRL expenditures and the FRL grants and contracts for 2010). Following the presentation Hal invited the committee for questions.

Before breaking into small groups, Hal gave some updates about the changes of the degree programs, the major research initiatives going on within the three departments and the Forestry Extension, the faculty hiring priorities, and the organizational strengthening of the OSU Foundation. Todd Bastian is the new Senior Development Director for the ESS Division. Todd will be helping Zak Hansen with the College of Forestry programs. Hal reported on his conversation with the Provost about the framework of activities and the rebranding of the College to entice higher investment by the university.

**Small Group Conversation Set-up**

Steve Tesch presented the charge for the group conversation. The participants were divided into three groups and were allocated 60 minutes for discussion. Each table conversation was facilitated by a Forestry and Natural Resources Extension faculty: Rick Fletcher, Brad Withrow-Robinson, or Amy Grotta. Each group identified a spokesperson to summarize the discussion for their table. The charge is described below:

1) Looking ahead over the next five years, what did each group see as the key issues affecting their respective organizations?

2) In light of #1, what did each group needs from the College as it is currently organized and focused, to help them to be successful? The group was asked to consider the teaching, research, and outreach aspects of the College’s mission in their thinking.
3) Looking at their evolving needs over a longer time horizon, perhaps 10-15 years, how would they define an evolving mission for a College and who would they include in the stakeholder base?

The groups reconvened at noon in RH 107 for lunch and for the afternoon session. Provost Sabah Randhawa was invited to attend the lunch and the working groups reporting to hear the challenges and needs, and ideas about the rebranding of the College and its programs.

**Group Conversation Reporting (Notes from Flip Chart)**

**Group 1:** Tom McLain, Jerry Brodie, Lee Miller, Carol Whipple, Barte Starker  
Rick Fletcher, Facilitator

1) **Key Issues:**

- Foresters with on the ground capacity (may not be enough)
- New market opportunities
  - Domestic/international
  - New products
  - Commodity markets will be tough
- Workforce
- Research – new knowledge needed
  - Research cooperatives, i.e. tree improvement
  - Productivity related
- Economics
  - Instability of financial markets. Need to have a better understanding
  - Impact on services, access to capital, markets
- Capture public’s imagination/get their support for our great natural products. Get visibility for expanding range of new wood products. (Improve public perception.) Capture larger market niche
- Shifting ownership of land and changing objectives (short term)
- State of the future forest nationally – where are we headed?
- Increasing production from young stands/new forests

2) **What do we need from CoF?**

**Teaching:**

- Graduates who can communicate with different audiences
- Need field and mill employees
- Ensure that forestry and natural resources is included in all levels of education
- Give non-forestry students access to forestry classes
- Need field ready, technical, competent graduates
- Graduates who understand business
Research:

- Industrial research, harvesting technology
- Integrated research, silvics/markets/policy
- Research that leads to better competitiveness, utilization, new products (i.e. biochar), cost control
- Maintain cooperative model for relevant topics

Outreach:

- Ensure curriculum at all levels includes factual (science-based) forestry information.
- Emphasize green building/wood product use
- Continue & restore Extension programs – Lane County has no forestry Extension

3) **Future:**

- Keep it a Forestry College – let it be our distinguishing feature
- Graduates able to manage forests, run mills, manage forest businesses and communicate this to stakeholders and the public

Group 2: Thomas Maness, Doug Decker, Scott Folk, Evan Smith, Jim James, Chris Jarmer
Amy Grotta, Facilitator

1) **Key Issues:**

- Generation gap
  - Landowners
  - Professionals/managers
  - Aging landowner base (increase retirement)
  - Contractors
- Succession planning - need
  - Need to transition leadership
- Urbanization
  - Changing priorities of small acreage owners
  - Changing priorities of stakeholders
  - Continued license to manage
  - Need dependence on Extension (OSWA)
- Continued investment in infrastructure (mills, land base, etc)
  - Must make Forestry relevant to greater society
- Herbicide use – social license
- Declining private sector investment in R&D – will become a concern
- Water – quality and quantity related to some points above
- Federal Forest Policy
2) **What Do We Need from CoF:**

- Continue current successful outputs – graduates research, outreach/Extension
- Graduates need to have excellent communications skills
- Graduates have some forest policy background and/or economics and the FM basics
- Exposure to legal/business or real estate to address issue of working forest conservation
- Research should be applied and should be 5 years ahead of current controversies in order to anticipate future issues, research should be done in conjunction w/industry or other stakeholders (i.e. co-ops)
- Graduates must be prepared to deal with controversy
- Research goal – further new technologies/economies and relate to private sector (ecosystem services, bioenergy – examples.)
- Extension is critical – partners see Extension as their lifeblood
- Outreach efforts should reach beyond landowner community
- Grads need business skills and an understanding of financing
- Filling the service provider’s skills gap – loggers, contractors. What could OSU’s role be in vocational development?
- Forest Engineering is still essential to industries, and to other land managers.
- “Re-engineering” in restoration context

3) **Future:**

- Education at multiple levels (public – landowner – student – voc.), College needs to be nimble enough to educate at all levels
- Stronger cultural competency and more diversity (both as mentors and in ability to relate to diverse public)
- Become a leader in technology and innovation (computer, biotech, etc…)  
  - Will attract broader student base
- How to make the public represented as stakeholder?
- Use rebranding as an opportunity to become the pre-eminent College – a.k.a. MIT
- Climate change research and application to land management to communities and businesses
- Changing trade scenarios  
  - Greater business community could be a future stakeholder  
  - K-12? As a stakeholder/partner could get public representation and address visibility of degree programs
- Capitalize on existing partnerships

**Group 3:** Paul Doescher, Gary Hartshorn, Catherine Mater, Ed Shepard, Rich Wininger, Tom Partin  
Brad Withrow-Robinson, Facilitator
1) **Key Issues**

- Need for highly capable graduates
  Capabilities will vary:
  - Very targeted, defined, ready to go tech skills
  - Skills, policy, communications
  - Tech skills for emerging practices (biomass)
  - Varied skills – Individually and as a team
  - NR breadth vs. for depth (specialty.)
- Develop a sweet spot
  - Broader to be relevant to society whole also producing vital tech skills
  - Need to be creative to find $ to make both service, be effective and relevant (R,T,E)
  - Cultural division within units
  - Question: Are current tech skills of graduates adequate? Yes across range of organizations
  - Tech competency is high (even improved): BS particularly – MS (skeptical?)
- Importance of attracting out of state & international students as part of financial package solution
- Online students
  - Growing area
  - 80% for Dept.
  - Education quality? Labs and field?
- Research capacity
  - Some industrial in-house
  - Most through co-ops, w/agencies
  - Particularly w/environment issues – must be objective and scientific = Multi-function – integrated
  - College of Forestry & global sustainability, global ecosystem services
- Recognize amount of change within a person’s career
  Seen as strong industrially, less so in NR - How to build one without losing the other?
- Link NR management (carbon, etc…) to human health (a coring criteria)
- Challenges (Africa, China, India, Middle East)
  - Grow skills sets that relate to these regions – be positioning the university internationally
- International focus
  - Involve international reps in advisory process
  - Online can be a great way to grow internationally
  - Must be reciprocal, relationship development (beyond training)
- Other advisors
  - Corporate
  - Government
    - Environmental
    - Multi-laterals

Allow us to maintain our core, even while bolstering internationally.
FRL AC Feedback

Ed Jensen and Brad Withrow-Robinson raised the issue of diversifying the advisory committee (i.e. teacher and international constituents).

Catherine Mater suggested that the committee get to a prioritization of what is needed to do next, to identify a pathway.

Evan Smith suggested thinking about themes that were going to tie things together to reposition the College and avoid getting into silos.

Hal explained that the Division of Earth Systems Science’s overarching theme is the 9 billion people challenge of safely and securely feeding, clothing, and housing them while keeping the planet a livable place.

Provost Randhawa sent a summary of the common themes from the conversation on key issues and College needs:

- Work ready graduates, effective in “diverse” environments, including strong business and communication skills;
- Integrative research; industry-relevant research;
- COF programs: broad-based but with some focus that brings excellence in targeted areas;
- On “branding”:
  - Captures public imagination,
  - Creates new “marketing” opportunities,
  - Can capture the “state of forestry” nationally and internationally,
  - Maintain forestry roots;
- Balance ~ Prioritization ~ Change;
- Predictable business model;

Provost Randhawa made some comments from the university perspective about the branding of academic institutions, competing internationally for students, faculty and resources, and moving towards a problem solving and integrated research institution. He described what the current challenges were, (i.e. how to change the Colleges’ centric view while maintaining identities? how to create new identities while sustaining core identities?). He mentioned that he is working with the President on an agenda for the next 2-3 years. Currently, they intend to focus on three key areas: 1) increasing industry based research at OSU; 2) attracting and retaining more diversified and higher achieving student body; 3) and maintaining a successful capital campaign.

Provost Randhawa discussed the need for the university to have a group of industry partners who will work with the President, Vice President of Research, and the University leadership to strengthen relationships.
Hal wanted to know if the committee felt that the College has rebranded enough to the point that it might need a marketing expert on staff to help figure out how to communicate.

Thomas Maness thought that the College should figure out a new business model to maintain excellence of the education programs. Will rebranding bring new money?

Catherine Mater felt that the College had made significant structural changes and that it needed to remarket itself.

Rich Wininger thought that it was unacceptable to lose the FE program and that if the problem was a funding issue of the College, rebranding will not fix the problem.

Provost Randhawa provided some comments regarding a business model that generates revenue. A significant proportion of revenue comes from international and non-resident students. He discussed the growth of international students in the College of Business and Engineering. OSU will provide the support for the College to build their teaching capacity. The university is looking to doubling the international student population.

**OSU/Iraqi Universities Partnership Update – Catherine Mater**

Catherine Mater gave a brief update on the partnership agreement involving the College of Forestry, College of Ag, and College of Engineering with the Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education to help rebuild and augment their curriculum in sustainable engineering, forestry, and agriculture. OSU is invited back in Iraq to meet with the Minister of Higher Education to reconfirm the 3rd level draft of a full work plan that identifies research, post graduate, PhD, and undergraduate activities between OSU and twelve universities from Iraq. Two top level Iraqi faculty members from each university will be part of this national education program. The faculty core team is expected to be at OSU in September. In term of foreign students, there will be fifty to a hundred additional students from Iraqi universities that would be appropriated for the College of Forestry, Ag, Engineering every year for five years.

**Capital Campaign Update - Zak Hansen**

Zak reported on this year’s successful campaign. The College of Forestry is one of the smallest colleges on campus but it has a relatively higher dollar goal in the campaign. The College campaign goal was increased by $9M. There are several pending commitments that will get the College close already. Over the course of the next two years, the College will have to raise 2.5M to reach its final goal. The College has tried to take advantage of the Provost’s Faculty Match Initiative, by the end of August the College will have 3 new agreements for new faculty positions. Zak thanked all the members who have contributed to the campaign.

**Wrap-up Comments – Hal Salwasser**

Hal felt that the committee had provided some affirmation about the College’s new directions and suggested some additional things to bring in; the internationalization of students is one of them. The College will need to figure out an advertising strategy to get the message in front of
more prospective students. Hal will be meeting with the senior industry principals of the state in July facilitated by the Oregon Forest Industries Council to discuss how to strengthen relationships and support for the College’s programs. Before the next FRL AC meeting in the fall, the College will present a new business plan to the Provost and will compel him to make a bridge investment. This will include enrollment growth and support for faculty enhancement to deliver the courses. Hal may have a draft to share with the committee by the end of the summer. Hal has welcomed ideas for renaming the College. He thanked the committee for the great intellectual energy they provided at the meeting and suggested to keep this format for the next meeting or two. Hal invited the committee members to provide their feedback about the day, what they have learned, and their advice on directions and how to move forward.

FRL AC Feedback

Evan Smith made a comment regarding renaming the College. The name of the College did not matter to him as long as the College keeps delivering the products that people are excited about, that it maintains its main focus on good education, producing good graduates who will get good jobs, and continued to be seen as the leader in the state. He wanted to know what can the committee members do individually to help with this process. He is excited about the College’s direction.

Thomas Maness stated that he was very optimistic and that there is a real need for the College to go on in the future. He was pleased that the committee heard the Provost’s comments. Provost Randhawa wants to help the College, but it has to be based on students’ enrollment growth, out of state and internationally. The College has to deliver a plan. The pro-school plan is one aspect of that and is designed with College partners in other states. We will have to build international relationships, partner with the Natural Resources (NR) program and possibly create a certificate program for NR students.

Jerry Brodie thought that the format of the meeting was good; It allowed more members to participate.

Rich Wininger was concerned that a new name would un-brand the College. Rich hoped that the College will continue to produce strong graduates and agreed that there is a role for R&D. Beyond that there are lots of ideas discussed and it was not clear what processes will be to move forward. Rich shared his concerns about hiring a consultant. From his past experience, the consultants did not hit the big issues.

Carol Whipple felt that it was instrumental that the College moves ahead and that it was an obligation to look at things differently. She attended a conference talk on living, dying, and suffering a global economy which tied with Hal’s comments on the 9 million people challenge to feed, cloth, and shelter. Carol explained why it did not bother her if the College was renamed.

Paul Doescher really liked the idea of broadening the base and broadening this advisory committee that would include K-12, international, environmental organization.
Jim Johnson visited the University of Minnesota. Their College of Forestry and Natural Resources was eliminated. They are now the Department of Forest Resources. Will this be the College of Forestry’s future? Jim felt that there was a great deal that was lost. He would hope that this doesn’t happen to the College of Forestry.

Jeff McDonnell thought that the international perspective was very good. Trading on our reputation name makes a lot of sense, how to do that at the graduate level?

Gary Hartshorn felt that it was less important to rename the College than to come up with a successful business model focusing on high quality end product.

Doug Decker attended the FRL AC meeting for the first time. He appreciated the fact that the College is leaning in other directions in term of emphasis. He encouraged the College to look at the five-year needs, to expand and protect the base, to continue to do the things that it does best, and to focus on working relationships and expand them. Regarding the name, the College should not worry about that now, instead it needs to figure out its mission and the name will follow that.

Scott Folk thought that there was an opportunity to define the College of Forestry for what is it really, a preeminent school in the nation. There is a need to establish that, to put it out there, and to build a business plan that moves the College in that direction. The business plan needs to be narrowed down and defined, include a 2-3 year transition plan that deals with issues with retirement, foreign students, etc… Take the industry partnerships to the next level. Build a business plan that attracts participation and funding. Scott referred to the Harvard endowment fund, they are so successful that they are investing in timber land. How does the College become this elite?

Ed Jensen wanted to assure the committee that the College has high quality students and very capable faculty, and a top notch educational program. Ed is confident that this will continue in the future. If anyone wanted verification of that, he invited the members to attend the spring student recognition dinner to hear some the stories and interact with the students.

Barte Starker suggested that the College should offer 1-2 term exchange program to attract international students to generate some revenue.

Ed Shepard concurred with what Doug Decker said about protecting and broadening the base. Ed saw his College changed its name and it is a changed school now. It doesn’t have the Forestry program that it had in the past. As far as the renaming of the College, there is a need for foresters with core competencies. Ed would prefer to see the word forest staying in there.

Tom Partin referred to when he was at OSU in 1970. The College was going through the same kind of transition, kept its core strength and moved forward. So whatever it takes to move forward the College should do it. His organization is also going through transitions all the time. Having this kind of discussion is very valuable to keep that trend going.

Lee Miller needed some clarification about the problem that the College has with having too many students for the amount of money allocated to educate them and too few students to meet
the University minimum metrics to survive. Lee felt that it was necessary to rename the College that people know things for what they are.

**Zak Hansen** is a business grad from OSU, he is very proud to be associated with the College. He stated that the industry provides a great service to our nation and the world.

**Roger Admiral** is also a business graduate from OSU and he would like to keep this College as a niche market not as a commodity.

**Tom McLain** thought that the College has been having a fascinating strategic conversation for some months. The foundation of higher education and its business model is shifting very fast and is hard to keep track of. He appreciated to hear affirmation of the things that the College is doing right, the things the committee valued and wanted to protect. Tom thanked the committee for that.

**Jim James** liked the meeting format and regarding the renaming of the College, the programs are much more important for him.

**Steve Tesch** made some comments about the 2009-10 College bi-annual report. The report contains information on the full breadth of the College of Forestry programs. Steve asked the members if when reading the report, they thought that the label of College of Forestry limited what the College does.

**Catherine Mater** thought that it was terrific that the Provost had taken the time out of his busy schedule to come and listen to the group conversation reporting. She thanked Hal for the great job he had done over the years.

**Hal Salwasser** thanked all the participants and adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.

**Roll Call**

**Advisory Board Members Present:**
Jerry Brodie, Doug Decker, Scott Folk, Gary Hartshorn, Catherine Mater, Lee Miller, Hal Salwasser, Ed Shepard, Evan Smith, Carol Whipple, Rich Wininger

**Members Absent:**
Bov Eav, Kent Connaugton, Dave Ivanoff, Bodie Shaw

**Ex officio Members Present:**
Jim James, Chris Jarmer (for Ray Wilkeson), Tom Partin, Barte Starker

**Member Absent:**
Jim Geisinger

**Guest Present:** Sabah Randhawa
College of Forestry (CoF) Executive Committee Members Present:
Roger Admiral, Paul Doescher, Jim Johnson, Thomas Maness, Jeff McDonnell, Tom McLain, Steve Tesch
Member Absent:
Eric Hansen

Dean’s Office Staff Present:
Nathalie Gitt

OSU Foundation Member Present:
Zak Hansen, CoF Development Officer

Facilitators Present:
Amy Grotta, Rick Fletcher, Brad Withrow-Robinson

Minutes prepared by Nathalie Gitt and revised by Steve Tesch