

Forestry Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, March 18, 2011

8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Richardson Hall 115

Meeting facilitated by Steve Tesch

Members present: Roger Admiral, Ed Jensen, Jim Johnson, Eric Hansen, Thomas Maness, Brenda McComb, Tom McLain, Jeff McDonnell, Hal Salwasser, Steve Tesch

Members absent: none

Guest: Lisa Ganio

Meeting Handouts:

- 1) 03-18-11 FEC Meeting Agenda – Steve Tesch
- 2) 03-03-11 FEC Meeting Draft Minutes – Steve Tesch
- 3) 03-18-11 Action Items Tracking List – Steve Tesch
- 4) NAUFRP Meeting Notes from December 7, 2010 / Indirect Costs and Tuition Payment / Meetings on the Hill -- Jim Johnson
- 5) Consulting Statistician Position Description – Lisa Ganio
- 6) Map Scenario 2 (Extension Reorganization) – Jim Johnson

I. Review Agenda and Status of Action Items Tracking List

No new agenda items were added.

Steve reviewed the current Action Items Tracking List.

II. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

There was one correction to the Food, Environment, and Conservation Stakeholders Meeting with OSU item. *Sonny* (not Hal) is "...taking the lead with the production folks to put together a joint letter." With that correction, the minutes from the March 3 FEC meeting were approved.

III. Updates and Conversation with the Dean

1) Statewide Budgets

- Hal discussed the legislative activity scheduled in Salem next week. Steve will testify at the Harvest Tax hearing March 29. OSU President Ed Ray will also be testifying on behalf of the Statewides that day as part of a series of OUS appearances. The public hearing is on March 31; Hal, Sonny Ramaswamy, and Scott Reed will be there, but won't be testifying. Each has identified people who will testify and is working to help them prepare. Following the hearing, the group established by the Statewide Legislative Advocacy Committee to be a voice on behalf of the Statewides, during and after this legislative session, will meet and then there will be a series of personal visits with members of their respective districts. Lee Miller is our representative in that group.
- The "add back" letter should be ready, asking for \$12 million, or 50% back, with each area identifying what that buys back in the respective programs. For the College of Forestry, it buys back our ability to hold onto faculty in specific areas.
- The draft on "Aligning OUS Statewide Public Services Programs for the 21st Century" has been submitted to the Provost. It identifies what goes away with the cuts and what specific consequences will result.

2) Path Forward

The Path Forward is that we've got to grow the number of graduates and the research enterprise – and we can't do either of those things without growing the faculty and staff. Hal has been working on the historic trends of expenditures by major budget lines – declines, growth, endowments -- to be able to better communicate with Sabah and possibly with legislators. It's a parallel process with that of the legislative process on the budget and what Sabah and Mark McCambridge are thinking about doing -- building a bridge to get the education subsidy out of our budget and building specific action items that will go into the Path Forward. It should all come to a convergence about the time we see the budget numbers.

3) Meeting with Governor's Natural Resources Staff

- Hal had a good meeting with the Governor's Natural Resources staff. Richard Whitman is taking the lead to get everyone through the legislative process. He seemed open during discussion of potential add backs to the budget on the Statewides and agreed to the point that the Statewides are being dealt with differently from the rest of the higher education in the budget. He took note about the puzzling language in the narrative of the balanced budget document. With no clarification on what the goals of the state are with regard to the outcomes identified ambiguously in that

document, we're still going with the goals in the Oregon Business Plan and the industry clusters we aligned with.

- The bill that creates a measure of autonomy for the University is still alive but, in exchange, we give the state a 15% reduction in the CSL. It doesn't help us until after the first biennium.
- The group reconsidering the budget allocation model within OSU is the faculty senate committee and the first document coming out of that is a new model based on the foundation of the old model, with cell values that are a combination of majors and student credit hours, resulting in one-third the funding of other programs. The model doesn't reward pre-eminence and uniqueness. Hall will share his updated PowerPoint presentation on historical funding trends with the group.

4) The Technical Advisory Group for the Fish & Wildlife Habitats and Managed Forests

Hal noted that the presentations of the Technical Advisory Group for the Fish & Wildlife Habitats and Managed Forests were stunning and the caliber of science being done through this program reaffirms the impact and value of our research enterprise. He said Jeff McDonnell's and Arne Skaugset's presentations were remarkable. Water is the number one topic and we have a lot going on in that area, but we don't currently have an identifiable program focus about the impacts of chemicals on habitat structure, toxicity to animals, or water quality and we need to articulate the scope of what we're engaged in. One option would be to shift some of the Mealey-Boise funds over to chemicals and tie it in with the working forests idea. Jeff McDonnell referenced results of a study soon to be out that documented residual herbicide in stream water beyond the first few storms after application. But in framing this, there's a whole suite of issues to consider. People are interested in water, productivity, chemicals, and wildlife. Hal asked how we pull it all together and articulate it to show people that we're on top of all of these things?

ACTION ITEM: Hal will think further about how best to frame this and Steve and Brenda, as Manager of the FWMF Program, with the collaboration of the other department heads, will assemble some people to discuss it further.

IV. Refilling Vacant Essential Expense Funding Positions – Process and Priorities – Steve Tesch / Hal Salwasser; Replacing Manuela Huso's position – Brenda McComb

With the question of what positions are critical to our future direction with regard to research and student success, the FEC discussed those principles that make a position essential and crafted the following list:

Principles

- Return on investment, e.g.,
 - Returned Overhead
 - E-campus
 - Endowments
 - Summer term
- Critical to teaching mission
 - Undergraduate (critical to required courses, critical to accreditation)
 - Graduate (600 level courses, support for research)
- Critical to Research Mission
- Programs Important to Stakeholders (example: Harvest Tax)
- Essential to Success of strategic plan, e.g.,
 - to reach enrollment goals
 - to reach outreach goals
 - to reach research goals

ACTION ITEM: In order to be successful in the future, Hal asked the department heads to identify those disciplines or staff skills needed that are either missing now or will soon be missing.

Wood Science and Engineering:

Structural Engineer

Value-added Bio-products Chemist

Forest Ecosystems and Society:

Policy (Johnson)

Plant Physiologist (Bond)

Below-ground Ecosystem (Cromack, Sollins, Perry)

Social Scientist, Urban/Rural Interface (Shindler/Shelby)

Forest Health? (Hansen/Shaw)

Statistical Consultant (staff)

Forest Engineering and Resource Management:

Forest Management /Policy (Adams/Johnson)

Forest Soils – Nutrition, Water, etc. (Schoenholtz)

Remote Sensing (Kiser/Hann)

Engineer, Roads and Geotechnical Engineering (Pyles)

Forest Regeneration (Rose)

Hydrologist (Skaugset)

Harvesting & Low-impact Harvesting (Kellogg)

Operations Management (Murphy)

Bio-energy Production (Sessions)

Engineering (Sessions)

Co-op Education Manager (staff)
Accreditation, Advising, Program Management (staff)

College-level Need:

Statistical Consultant
SSO Staff (if enrollment goes up)

FNR:

One Field Agent
Four Extension Specialists: Urban Forestry, Engineering (Harvesting), Economics,
& Silviculturist/Management
Two Staff (one office staff; one program assistant for OWIC)
Web Support

ACTION ITEM: For the purpose of a future discussion, Hal asked the FEC to be thinking of people who might leave to take other positions. In addition, because the above list may not be complete, Hal invited FEC members to add any omissions after the minutes come out.

The FEC moved on to specifically discuss filling the Statistical Consultant position vacated by Manuela Huso. The discussion focused on:

- Making the position a college-level position for more equitable access
- Establishing a protocol for access
- Creating / communicating expectations for what the consultant will /will not do
- Prioritization /budget differences between research / educational components.

ACTION ITEM: The department heads and Lisa will redefine the position and come back to the FEC with a proposal. Hal will defer making a decision on the proposal until June at the latest. He's inclined to hire the position if it's a college-level position and if the rules for access are equitable and fair.

V. Provost Fellowship / Scholarship Debrief – Steve Tesch / Lisa Ganio

Steve Tesch reviewed 23 Provost Fellowship / Scholarship applications. Lisa Ganio represented him at the committee meeting. Lisa said the main thing was to look for students that clearly had goals in mind and had demonstrated that they were approaching those goals and had a history of working through the goals they set and moving forward. Out of a potential for 100 or more fellowship applications, only 37 were submitted. Only 14 out of 50 possible scholarship applications were submitted. Some were double nominations. There were a lot of 800 scores on the quantitative GRE. Most GPAs were in the high 3s. GRA scores under the 50 percentile were tossed. There were a variety of ways that people documented long-term support for PhD programs. Only three students nominated and reviewed by Steve and Lisa had any publications, a main

criterion. One reason is that there were a lot of nominations for students with only a bachelor's degree who were being put forward for a PhD program. There were NSF REU, leadership, and scholarship awards. Anyone nominated had some sort of distinction, with most letters of recommendation putting people in the top 5%, often the top 1-2%. One issue shaping the views of reviewers was the quality of the candidate letters and statements. It appears there will be money for this again next year, although they may redo the scoring criteria to make the publications requirement less restrictive.

VI. SAF Accreditation Visit – Thomas Maness

Thomas Maness reported that the SAF Accreditation Visit is scheduled for May 24-26, with the self-study due April 1 internally and to the review team by April 24. We have a schedule put together and a distinguished team coming. We expect good feedback on our program, which is expected to work its way into the curriculum change and program development. Steve said one issue is the MF in Forestry and Silviculture accreditation. Last time we had two MFs accredited – a general MF in Forestry, housed in the FR department and an MF in Forestry, with a specialization in silviculture, jointly offered by Forest Science and Forest Resources. These were specific programs with an identified curriculum under the old structure. Both FERM and FES have new degree programs with MFs approved, but the issue is whether we want those MFs accredited. Ed Jensen said that because the two previous MF degrees existed as specific programs in the past, but don't appear to be moving into the future, we don't really have anything to accredit and yet we've told the review team that we want them to accredit our MF program.

ACTION ITEM: FERM and FES Departments need to agree on SAF accreditation of MF in Forestry program. SAF prep committee will craft self-study accordingly. The self-study is due April 1 internally and to the review team by April 24.

VII. ARCS Foundation Campus Visit – Steve Tesch

A larger leadership group from the Achievement Rewards for College Scientists (ARCS) Foundation will be coming to campus April 6 to find out more about the activities in Engineering, Oceanography, and Forestry. There is a lunch. Tom McLain will give them a tour of our building. Jeff McDonnell will talk to them about his hydrology research. This is the group that's bringing the funding for high-achieving PhD students to us. Tom McLain has a committee working on identifying candidates for the first fellowship this year.

VIII. NAUFRP Washington DC Debrief – Jim Johnson

Jim Johnson attended the NAUFRP meeting in Washington, DC last week, followed by visits to four of the five offices of our members of the House and the two Senate offices. All six office visits went very well. He met with knowledgeable staff, mostly talking

about our budget requests for formula funds and AFRI, from a national sense, and also discussing what individuals are doing in the way of forestry and natural resources in Oregon. At the NAUFRP meeting, there was a NIFA update, with the bad news being that they're suspending the climate change CAPS effort, although it looks like they might try to bring that back next year. There are reverse site visits going on for the bioenergy CAPS proposal right now. And the other big item is one that NAUFRP has been working on with the Forest Service, concerning different types of agreements and what will allow the payment of indirect costs and what will allow payment of tuition. In the handout for this item, from page two on, a table shows the different types of agreements, the description and purpose, and whether or not tuition and indirect costs are allowable under that type of agreement. The bottom line is that the type of agreement dictates the answer about indirect costs and tuition. It appears the FS Research Station directors have some latitude in managing the process.

ACTION ITEM: Hal will discuss with Bov Eav from PNW.

IX. Extension Update – Jim Johnson

Jim shared a handout showing an administrative map of the reorganization scenario the Extension Cabinet recommended to Scott Reed. The model would create 13 Extension districts or regions, each one with a full-time area administrator responsible for supervising faculty and budgets within their area. Many area administrators would be teamed with superintendents of agricultural research stations in Clackamas, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, Lake, and Jefferson Counties, at a minimum. Staff chair positions are being eliminated. In the forestry program, a number of people would end up doing programming in more than one area, but would be supervised by the area administrator in the county in which they're housed. The reorganization scenario still needs to be vetted within the College of Ag Sciences and Ag Experiment Stations.

X. Additional Announcements

Hal said the feedback he got from John Bailey's presentation in Palm Springs was really fantastic. The Alumni Association has a number of events during the year where they feature faculty presentations, so if any faculty are interested in or inclined to be good public speakers – like John Bailey or Jeff McDonnell – I wouldn't be surprised if they're invited.

Ed Jensen, in a recent conversation with two reps from the College of Engineering, learned that because of enrollment growth, but no increased capacity in the Pro School, they're on the verge of turning down 200-250 students, many of whom are in the 3.0-3.4 GPA range. While he's not sure what the avenue would be, this may be an opportunity for us to present those students with new majors.

The meeting adjourned at Noon.

Minutes prepared by Julie Howard and reviewed by Steve Tesch