Forestry Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Friday, January 22, 2010
8:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Richardson Hall 115

Meeting facilitated by Steve Tesch

List of Attendees:
Members present: Roger Admiral, Eric Hansen, Barbara Bond, Ed Jensen, Jim Johnson, Thomas Maness, Brenda McComb, Tom McLain, Steve Tesch, Hal Salwasser

Guests: Paul Doescher

Meeting Handouts:
1) 01-08-10 FEC Meeting Minutes
2) 01-21-10 Action Items Tracking List
3) Guidelines for the conduct of 5-year review of endowed position Holders, Sept. 2009
4) Environmental Synthesis Center RFP - PPT Handout
5) The Faculty of Forest Management Proposal
6) PACK Essay Awards New Guidelines for 2010

I. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting
Need to make one change on the 01-08-10 minutes, page 2, regarding the College website transition timeline, should be April not March. Minutes were approved as revised.

II. Review Agenda and Status of Past Action Items
- OWEB related issues was added on the agenda
- Sabah approved the scoping of process and obstacles for potential sale of the Spaulding tract
- The guidelines for the endowed faculty reviews was on the agenda for clarification
- College website transitions: Ed found a student photographer. WSE is trying to recruit a student help for their content, FERM is recruiting external help to transition their website and get special training.
- College Forests "willingness to pay study": Waiting for the data analysis and publication to be completed before further activity on action items.
- Campus scheduling of additional COF classrooms: Hal approved a memo that reduced the list of COF room available for OSU to use and submitted it to Sabah. A tour of the College of Forestry classrooms with Registrar's staff is scheduled for January 28th.
- No further updates on the action tracking list.

III. Updates and Conversation with the Dean
This was another opportunity for conversation with Hal and FEC about:
- Divisions… little new news.
- Hal had discovered John Cassidy’s prior experience as Executive Dean at Ohio State University under division structure there. [Hal will try to meet with John before he leaves OSU to find out about his experience and accomplishments.]
- ESS Division Forum next week in MU 208, Hal was curious about expected CoF attendance relative to room capacity. [Hal asked DHs for an estimated number of how many people from CoF will participate.] May be a large turnout from COAS as faculty have expressed concerns about the relationship between Ag, CoF and COAS. President Ray’s visit, CoF participation, and preparation of questions for this meeting. Suggested questions: i.e. what are the divisions supposed to do and how do they improve the university’s ability to perform on the strategic plan? How are the executive deans expected to facilitate the mission and vision of the university with no incentives or authority? President’s insight on how to reduce budget? [Hal asked DH’s if they had any ideas about how many people will attend. Send mtg. reminder!]
- Division’s new initiatives, centers, and institutes, building bridges with other units
- Lack of incentives and implications of not meeting the March 15 deadlines for restructuring and realignment proposals.
- The future participation of faculty in the Department of Economics in the Applied Economics program
- The new medical insurance retirement incentive package that will be released next week.
- Update on proposed Faculty Senate process to expedite the curricular review process following March 15 curricular changes proposal deadline
- Update on RRM/HHS proposal

Actions Items:
- Hal would like to meet with John Cassidy about his prior role as Executive Dean at Ohio State.
- Upcoming Divisional Forums- send an email to faculty as a reminder and schedule on FEC calendars
- DH will get a feel for how many faculty will attend for forum and President Ray’s visit – prepare sets of questions for the visit and send a reminder to faculty.
IV. **Guidelines for Endowed Faculty Reviews**

Hal reviewed the guidelines for the endowed faculty positions review process drafted by the Department Heads and wanted clarification on the committee process. The main question discussed was who should organize and lead the review effort for respective endowed faculty? One alternative would be to select a DH or other than the one from the incumbent's current department to lead the review to broaden its independence. The purpose of this document is to standardize the process among the departments. The committee provided some feedback.

**Changes:**
- External faculty will be appointed as appropriate on all committees.
- The appointing authority makes recommendations to the Dean who will approve the committee chair (the incumbent’s department head will initiate the process, makes recommendations to the Dean about who is on the team, then Dean approve, then move forward with the process).
- The incumbent’s department head can never be the chair of the committee.
- Jim Johnson discouraged the inclusion of tenure track faculty on review committee to avoid potential for reprisal.

**Action Item:**
Steve will revise the guidelines to reflect the committee’s comments and will reroute for final approval.

V. **NSF Environmental Synthesis Center RFP and Request for Support**

A few weeks ago, NSF announced a RFP proposal for the development of the Environmental Synthesis Center. The successful host institution would receive $6 million per year for 5 years to support the Center with the possibility of another five-year renewal. The RFP is described at: [http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2010/nsf10521/nsf10521.htm](http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2010/nsf10521/nsf10521.htm). The cross campus interest was very high. Rich Holdren has offered cover $8000 to cover the expenses of a proposal writer, Donn Forbes, to assist in preparing a competitive pre-proposal. A pre-proposal is due in March; if selected, a full proposal due in July, and a site visit at some point after that. The cost to cover Donn's time and travel is $21,000 for preparation of the pre-proposal. Such a Center would rely heavily on involvement of faculty from COAS, COS, COF, and CAS, with somewhat less, though very important, involvement from CLA, HHS, and Engineering. To facilitate this effort, Brenda suggested that if COAS, CoF, Ag, and COS could each contribute $2500 and HHS, CLA and Engineering could contribute $1000 then the costs for the proposal writer could be covered for this first step in the process.
Dr. Reichman, former Director of NCEAS, UC Santa Barbara, will be coming to campus on Monday, January 25 afternoon to provide his perspective on what would constitute a successful proposal and answer questions.

**Action Items:**
Hal and Steve will join the lunch meeting with Dr. Jim Reichman and the meeting with Rich Holdren on Monday afternoon. Brenda requested others to let her know of any other possible contributors or names of other logical partners.

**Decision**
Hal was in support for investing $2500 for the development of a pre-proposal. (Use innovation funds to support)

**VI. Faculty Concerns about Software Models in CoF Classes**
Thomas Maness was charged to address the concerns expressed by the memo of October 5th by Hann and others with regard to the use of software for instructional purposes and to investigate University’s conflict of interest policy. Thomas reported back to the FEC about the follow-up. He asked the faculty who had raised the concerns to draft some guiding principles. The draft policy will be discussed with the FERM Faculty at the next Departmental meeting. It is possible this can be handled as a departmental issue.

**Action Item:**
Thomas will report back at next FEC after the FERM meeting.

**VII. Faculty of Forest Management**
This was a discussion about the proposal for a Faculty of Forest Management (FM) for managing the curriculum of the forest management degree program. Thomas and Ed gave the FEC an overview of the proposal with background information. This proposal includes a vision for a comprehensive forest management degree program that would educate students for diverse careers with agencies, private industry, consultants, and NGOs. Thomas explained his proposal is for him to serve as the administrative lead for the Faculty of FM. In the course of the discussion, the committee explored several alternative models of possible leadership (FERM DH lead, FERM and FES DHs serve as co-directors, or select a faculty member as program director who has authority.)

**Decision:**
Hal, with support from FEC, supported the concept of the Faculty of Forest Management as per the proposal, with Thomas as its initial leader. Hal empowered Thomas to move forward in establishing the faculty of Forest Management and establishing a curriculum committee with a designated chair. The key goals are to provide an immediate functional cross departmental mechanism for managing the FM curriculum and to provide visible internal and external leadership for the FM degree program. Progress will be reviewed periodically and the model fine tuned as needed.

**Action Item:**  
Thomas, with support from Ed, will engage faculty in FERM and FES to discuss implementation of the Dean’s charge. Thomas will report back to FEC as progress is made.

**VIII. Others**

   Ed gave an update on the application process, currently at 4 participants registered, and COF will support one more.

b. **Pack Essay Awards – Ed Jensen**  
   Ed is trying to reinvigorate this regional award. He made some modifications to proposed 2010 guidelines and asked for feedback.  
   **Action Items:**  
   Create a third category focused on OP-Ed writing and limit to 500 words. The award winning essays will be shared internally.

c. **Board of Visitors Mentoring Awards Update – Ed Jensen**  
   Ed gave the committee an upbeat update on the process of matching faculty mentors with students. Most faculty projects have been successfully matched with students.

d. **Alumni Awards – Steve Tesch**  
   **Action Item:**  
   Department Heads were requested to submit a proposal to FEC about how to proceed with Alumni Awards (selection process, number of awards, timing, and venue for recognition [e.g. award lunch or Student Awards Ceremony]).

e. **Spring Fernhopper Day – Steve Tesch**  
   **Action Item:**  
   Plan for the same format as last year. Department Heads were requested to identify one 30 minute presentation from each department. Goal is to select presentation themes that are aligned with our updated strategic vision report. This event is scheduled in
conjunction with Mom’s week-end and spring football game.

f. **OWEB – Jim Johnson**
The conservation community is advancing a ballot initiative to limit flexibility for OWEB and Oregon Parks and Recreation Department use of Oregon Lottery Funds. There are concerns with the current ballot language because it may preclude allocation of awards from these agencies to COF projects. CoF will not support this measure as written.

**Action Item:**
Strive to get the language in the ballot measure revised. Jim will talk to Hal.

---

**Minutes submitted by Nathalie Gitt and revised by Steve Tesch**
FEC Website: [http://www.cof.orst.edu/cof/admin/execom/index.php](http://www.cof.orst.edu/cof/admin/execom/index.php)