Hal Salwasser called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Hal thanked the members who have been reappointed for one more year to serve on the FRL Advisory Committee and welcomed the new members: Scott Folk, Tom Holt, and Bodie Shaw.

Chair Catherine Mater made her welcoming remarks. Participants introduced themselves. Catherine provided updates on the agreement for the partnership between 26 Iraqi universities and OSU College of Forestry, College of Ag, and College of Engineering and the new terrestrial scanning technology and carbon storage overlay program that OSU will be testing out.

The June 29, 2011 meeting minutes were approved.

The purpose of the meeting was for the committee to discuss the nature of the function of the advisory committee and the new business plan for the College of Forestry. Historically the FRL Advisory Committee was established by statute to advise the College on the research enterprise. Hal explained how the committee has functioned these last several years and the changes to come. Hal reported on his conversation with members of the Oregon Forest Industries Council, Jim James, and Nancy Hathaway from the Oregon Small Woodlands Association about a possible change in the harvest tax rate to generate more revenues to support the College and the Research Lab, and to create a stronger role for people who contribute to the harvest tax.

Hal gave a status report and update on the following topics:

- Students’ enrollment for the Natural Resources, Forest Management, Forest Engineering, and the Renewable Materials undergraduate degree programs
- Pro-School for professional forest management and engineering degree programs and the cooperative education program proposal
- Communication plan for College marketing and recruiting
- Research programs, federal grants, and concerns with agencies who administered competitive grants programs
- Legislative session and the 18-25% reduction in state appropriation to the FRL,
- Harvest tax revenue
- Upcoming CoF timber sale to help with the budget situation
- Provost’s Faculty Hiring initiatives that will fund new positions for the ESS Division and for the College of Forestry
- Rebuilding the College’s teaching capacity
- Search for new College Forests Director
Hal distributed a draft for the business plan of the College of Forestry. The goal is to have a new business model in place by December for the College and the FRL to present to the Provost. Hal described the five goals and the six elements of the business plan.

Participants were invited to have small group discussion about the business plan. The committee was charged to provide their feedback on the following questions:

1) What did the group like or dislike about the business plan for the College of Forestry?
2) Provide ideas on how the advisory committee could function differently if that business model was to include element #5 from the draft business plan.

Hal made reference to 3 models of advisory committees: Fish & Wildlife Habitat in Managed Forests Advisory Committee, ETIC, Wood Based Composites Center and asked for deliberations on these models.

After lunch the committee reconvened to report on their group discussions. The following is the recap of the group flipchart notes.

**Group 1 - Facilitated by Barbara Lachenbruch**
Jerry Brodie, Paul Doescher, Gary Hartshorn, Ed Shepard, Ray Wilkeson, Rich Wininger
Spokesperson: David Ivanoff

- Need background for FRL Advisory Committee [Need to see programs (separated), budget, enrollment, how much revenue from different sources (distance ed, grants, etc.)]
  Chart: current funding structure – Where does $ come from, what percent does CoF have control over, how variable year to year, salaries (something to read)
- Need better understanding
- Moving from passive to active audience – In transition now
- Willing to pore over background info before meeting within reason
- Need discussion:
  - What are outcomes of programs (rather than where can we get $)
  - Need preface to business plan with core values
  - Group could easily come up with what industry, government, etc… need.
- Meeting the customers’ needs – Agencies, industry, policy makers, students
- What action plan to recruit out of state? Do we use industry professionals?
- Group can help on producing full suite:
  - Employment-ready graduates (not a goal of “environmental” degrees) as well as natural-resource people.
- Harvest tax increase
  → 1) Matching increase: State has to continue to match it $ for $ (traditional professional degree programs, extension).
  → 2) New $ has to meet industry’s needs (teaching more important than research).

How much industry “control” will faculty accept?
Would like to see that the harvest tax revenue is going toward active management of forest as POSITIVE [Example: Biomass]
• Group can harp on promoting positive image of active management of forests, social license for forestry.
• Can board help us break down silos?
• Excellent to have undergrads from different majors learn to interact, respect each other’s strengths.
• Have think tank discussions of real-life forestry with FRL AC as panelists, debaters with faculty and students. [Use individual as resources]
• Get quality graduates.
• Meet three times a year to provide the committee with the high level view on how the revenue stream work on an annual basis, what’s variable from one year to the next, summary of the various research projects.

**Group 2** - Facilitated by David Hibbs
Doug Decker, Scott Folk, Thomas Maness, Catherine Mater
Spokesperson: Evan Smith

1) “Full Picture” don’t want to get into details but need to understand business/financial structure/operations.
   • Set specific targets and timelines w/performance indicators – use this committee to help attract new resources but need to have confidence and knowledge about how it works.
   • Financial statements provided ahead of time, annual plan/budget…
   • Form a budget subcommittee engaged on a more frequent basis?

2) Lots of model approaches – want to learn more about current allocation of harvest tax and other approaches.
   Don’t want to create unnecessary structure/costs but rate payers seek increased accountability and transparency about how new money is spent/decisions on research plans.
   Use the advisory committee more effectively.

**Group 3** - Facilitated by Randy Rosenberger
Bov Eav, Eric Hansen, Tom Holt, Jim James, Bodie Shaw, Ken Weinke
Spokesperson: Tom Holt

1) Likes and Dislikes of Business Plan
   • Need projections/outcomes of business plan
   • Grow research enterprise
      • Why single out research? Too narrow
         ▪ There are other important components [view business plan more broadly – over goals address other areas]
   • Where are the institutional incentives?
      OSU level to pursue business plan [around 20% funding from OSU had dollars
not balanced w/FTE allocations]

- Business plan should be placed within global concerns
  - Too narrow [white paper that explores shares (research, economy, etc…) of OSU to PNW to nation to globe.

- Need accountability and tracking of funds (esp. industry)
  - Joint failure – need cooperation and communication
  - Return on investment from research [what are the research goals, success at achieving goals.]

- Market analysis of demand for education programs
  - Outdated info from OFRI
  - Need to update, broaden goals, expand scope
  - Not get caught up in OSU enrollment game

- Educational programs of broad interest to meet enrollment goals
  - Pro: Draw in broader base of students
  - Con: Need to retain forestry focus and contributions to state

- Revenue sharing with OSU
  - Treat as only temporary but rebuild contingent on funding model

2) Role of FRL AC

- Harvest tax
  - Concern to set CoF funding on a fluctuating base
  - Change in federal land management and harvest

- ETIC
  - Can work, needs OSU/internal consistency
    - Model? Needs oversight on allocation of funds

Hierarchical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some kind of advisory group</th>
<th>$ Harvest Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals players (BoV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL AC and Research Coops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Need active participation of primary players in broader goals of CoF (as it relates to $HT)
- FRL AC oversight on harvest tax dollars allocations won’t pass OFIC DOA!
- Need involvement in defining areas of research and priorities
  - Provide direction, not control
  - Perceptions matter
Annual white paper from OFIC [highest priorities]

- Goals with industry need to be identified (i.e. Coops)
- Does OFIC need a research focus (maybe not)
- Need clarification about allocation of current harvest tax dollars and additional harvest tax dollars
- Funding for positions (sunk costs)
- Discretionary funds for conducting research

The committee wanted to learn more about how the College functions as a business unit.

Action Items:
The College will work on reformatting the budget/annual plan information to present to the committee at the next FRL AC meeting. The committee asked to get the budget breakout with numbers and explanations to them prior to the next meeting. Steve Tesch, Roger Admiral, Tom Holt, Evan Smith, and Scott Folk formed a financial subcommittee. They will meet first week in January to go over the College finances. The group discussed levels of advisory committee and the future need for additional committees, i.e. performance metrics and education subcommittees. Dave Ivanoff requested to get an organizational chart for the departments and the list of the research coops.

Hal gave an update on the capital campaign’s extension and new target. As part of this campaign, the Provost has matched the earnings on the size of the endowments one for one up to a total of $2M during five years. The College of Forestry got three endowments that will support existing faculty. There will be another small window of opportunity for the College to get another financial boost.

Committee’s Final Comments and Suggestions

Ray Wilkeson – Ray thought that the group had a healthy discussion. This was the continuation of the discussion that OFIC has had to redefine the relationship between the forest industry and OSU College of Forestry to get a stronger College for the future. There is still a lot of lack of clarity on the financial side. The industry is considering increasing its commitment to the college and needs to be able to make it really clear of what the purpose of it is and what the expectations are.

Scott Folk – Scott felt that this was a productive meeting that Hal received lots of direct feedback. He thought that the group did not take enough time to talk about the positives. He did not hear any criticism on the overall goal/directions of the College. He appreciated the great job that the staff is doing with the limited resources.

Rich Wininger – Rich reiterated the importance of OSU College of Forestry across the U.S. and Canada. He thought that there is always concerned about the budget issues and programs but all of this can be tackled. There is just some work to be done.
Eric Hansen – Eric was encouraged about the atmosphere and the committee’s desire to improve interaction and collaboration. His recommendation was to work on a more effective communication to make that happen.

Tom Holt – Tom agreed on everything that was said. He asked why the College had a separate Fish & Wildlife Habitat Committee and was concerned with having too many advisory committees.

Bodie Shaw – Bodie represents the Indian Country. He feels that Indian Country has a lot to bring on the table and should stay engaged with the FRL AC as it continues to progress. Bodie had some tactical questions about quantifying the impacts with the business plan’s objectives. He is hoping that this information will come out from the synthesis that Hal will send back to the larger group. Bodie is interested in future engagement with the College. He is an alumnus and recently hired graduates from OSU for his regional forester and timber sale positions. He is very encouraged to hear how the College and the FRL AC is looking at the future for academics and curriculum and he is looking forward to stay engaged.

Paul Doescher – That was Paul’s second meeting with the FRL Advisory Committee and he noticed a change of attitude and opinion about the College’s wide array of curricular area.

Thomas Maness – Thomas suggested that this is the right time to look at the College critically. The College is looking at a number of new leadership positions that will be important and make a difference for the future. Thomas felt that most of the discussion was around the challenges but reminded the committee that there are two strong professional forestry schools in the West: University of British Columbia and OSU. The College of Forestry is about double the size in terms of undergraduate and graduate population. FERM is searching for four new faculty in some key areas important for the College. The search committees included industry participation. Thomas shared his appreciation for the FRL AC support.

Steve Tesch – Steve thanked the committee for their support and engagement for building a stronger relationship. Steve let the committee know about all the good things happening in the College and the two national championships that CoF students received this year.

Marv Pyles – Marv is looking forward to help find a better way to communicate to the FRL AC what we do from the budgetary and funding perspectives. He is intrigued about how to engage this group better than done in the past on the education side. His recommendation is to be thinking five or ten years out. The future from a funding perspective is daunting in his opinion.

Evan Smith – Evan encouraged the committee to think about the opportunities for being supportive of the College of Forestry. Few weeks ago, he helped Thomas Maness teach a Forest Economics class and lab. Evan echoed the point of being at the inflection point with Forestry as its role and society and the need to work collectively on how to best seize the opportunities for the future.

Bov Eav – Bov liked the ideas in the business plan and the new direction of the College. The College needs to continue to educate professional foresters and forest engineers of the future.
Dave Ivanoff – Dave felt that this meeting was most enjoyable. With the steps taken in term of deliverables, Dave will be able to be a more active member and council. Dave thanked Hal for the good work he has done with the College and the advocacy position he has taken for the forestry profession.

Ed Shepard – Ed appreciated the meeting and felt that the committee is growing and evolving to help the College of Forestry. Ed will be visiting with the College of Forestry students and faculty in January. Ed thanked Hal for his many years of service to the College.

Ken Wienke – Ken thanked Hal for being part of this advisory committee. He would like to know what kind of input will help the College. He would like to help anyway he can.

Gary Hartshorn – Gary was pleased and impressed with the progress that this group is making collectively, moving from a passive audience to a pro-active involved group.

Dave Hibbs - Dave would like the committee to continue to help the college identify new opportunities in the things it could be doing to augment the traditional things that the College is already doing.

Catherine Matter – Catherine thanked Hal for his incredible vision even when he is being hit from all different sides and for taking this College to a new direction to lead the world.

Hal thanked the committee for spending the time with helping the College chart its future. He is looking for the next meeting. His goal is to leave his predecessor with a very strong College.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Nathalie Gitt and revised by Steve Tesch

Roll Call

Advisory Board Members Present:
Boe Eav, Scott Folk, Gary Hartshorn, Tom Holt, Dave Ivanoff, Catherine Mater, Lee Miller, Hal Salwasser, Bodie Shaw, Ed Shepard, Evan Smith, Ken Weinke, Rich Wininger

Members Absent:
Jerry Brodie, Kent Connaughton, Doug Decker, Lee Miller, Carol Whipple

Ex officio Member Present:
Ray Wilkeson

Members Absent:
Jim Geisinger, Jim James, Tom Partin

College of Forestry (CoF) Executive Committee Members Present:
Roger Admiral, Paul Doescher, Eric Hansen, Ed Jensen, Thomas Maness, Marv Pyles, Randy Rosenberger, Steve Tesch

**Member Absent:**
Jim Johnson

**Facilitators**
Dave Hibbs, Barbara Lachenbruch, and Randy Rosenberger

**Dean’s Office Staff:**
Nathalie Gitt